PRISM

AN ANGLICAN MONTHLY

November 1961 Vol. V. No. 11 1s. 6d.

NATURAL LAW

PRISM
177 REGENT STREET
LONDON, W.1
Telephone: REGent 0911

Editor:
TIMOTHY BEAUMONT
Editorial Advisory Committee:
ROBIN DENNISTON
CHRISTOPHER MARTIN
ROBIN MINNEY
NICHOLAS MOSLEY

Subscription rates (*post free*):
3 months, 5s.
6 months, 10s.
12 months, 20s.
Prism can be obtained at Church bookshops

THIS MONTH

		Page
NATURAL LAW AND DIVINE PROVIDENCE (1)	Martin Jarrett-Kerr C.R.	1
NATURAL LAW AND DIVINE PROVIDENCE (2)	Peter Coleman	11
POEM	Elizabeth Dixon	14
CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE TIMES		15
SOCIOLOGICAL SURVEY	Leslie Harman	17
"I SAY, BISHOP"	Christopher Wansey	27
CONDUCTED EUCHARIST	Henry Burgess	30
LETTER FROM GHANA	Anthony Hyland	33
TWO WORLDS OF LESLIE PAUL	Nicholas Mosley	39
ONE CHAPLAIN'S WEEK	Simon Phipps	43
COMMENT		46
LETTERS		50
REVIEW		60
THE COMING GREAT CHURCH	John Wilkinson	62

Natural Law and Divine Providence (1)

MARTIN JARRETT-KERR, C.R.

To mention "Natural Law" in the presence of jurists today is to be greeted with either an uncomfortable silence, a polite scepticism or straight expostulation. Not long ago in the correspondence columns of *The Times* Sir Henry Slesser, sometime an Appeal Judge, pleaded for the recovery of Natural Law concepts; he was at once answered by another Roman Catholic, Mr. Norman St. J. Stevas, who said (in effect) that it was all very well talking airily about Natural Law, but the concept was so remote, so general, and so ill-defined that it was in fact inapplicable to any concrete circumstances. Another law theorist, who has written most illuminatingly about changing notions and applications of law in a changing society, Prof. W. Friedmann (Professor of Law, and Director of International Legal Research, Columbia University), has said this (he is discussing anti-trust laws in the U.S.A.):

> A basic philosophy of values must underlie any legal approach to the problem of excessive concentration of economic power. . . . But the answer to a problem which is as complex as modern industrial society as a whole cannot be sought in dogmatic deductions from "Natural Law" premises.[1]

There are few who would be brave enough to challenge this statement.

The strength behind Prof. Friedmann's position (which is no doubt that of the majority of English-speaking jurists) lies in the fact that the judiciary in the United States, operating and interpreting a body of law which is impregnated with these "Natural Law premises", has in fact had to shift its ground continually in various fields, notably those of commercial enterprise and race relations. It is a striking fact that there was some dispute among the Founding Fathers about the famous phrase concerning man's right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". Samuel Adams wanted "life, liberty and property"; and Justice Brewer, maintaining that the Constitution should be read in the light of the Declaration of Independence, cited the Declaration as guaranteeing "the inalienable rights of the sacredness of life, of liberty, and of

property". In fact it was Thomas Jefferson who substituted the words "pursuit of happiness" for "property". And the disputes about commercial monopolies and restraint of capitalist competition have reflected the basic uncertainty about the precise degree of sacredness that "property" should be accorded. In an extraordinary case (Oleff v. Hodapp) decided by the Supreme Court of Ohio in 1935, it looks as if the implication of the Court was that "property" is more sacred than "life". The question was whether a murderer, who had caused his uncle (to whose property he was heir) to be murdered, could still be regarded as the rightful heir; and the Court found that he could. The Judge said:

> We are not subscribing to the righteousness of Tego (the murderer)'s legal status; but this is a court of law and not a theological institution. . . . Property cannot be taken from an individual who is legally entitled to it because he violates a public policy. Property rights are too sacred to be subjected to a danger of that character. We experience no satisfaction in holding that Tego is entitled to this account; but that is the law, and we must so find.

On this, one jurist has commented:

> Apparently, if property rights were less sacred, or if the right of life were more sacred, the Court might have decided the case against the murderer Tego and in favour of the representatives of the murdered uncle.

The fact that the Court was working from a Natural Law concept of property is enough to explain why Natural Law has been so much discredited.

The other field in which Natural Law operated unjustly was in race relations. In the case "State v. Bell", decided by the Supreme Court of Tennessee, 1872, a white man and his coloured wife, who had been married in Mississippi (where State law permitted it), moved to Tennessee where miscegenation was a crime. In the lower court the man was acquitted; but on appeal he was convicted, on the ground that the marriage was against the public policy and good morals of the State. Justice Turney, for the Supreme Court, said:

> Extend the rule to the width asked for by the defendant, and we might have in Tennessee the father living with his daughter, the son with the mother, the brother with the sister, in lawful wedlock, because they had formed such relations in a state or country where they were not prohibited. The Turk or Mohammedan, with his numerous wives, may establish his harem at the doors of the capitol, and we are without remedy. Yet none of these are more

> revolting, more to be avoided, *or more unnatural,* than the case before us. (Italics mine.)

Now no doubt upholders of Natural Law would deny that this was a valid appeal to what is "natural". But—and this is the nub of the objection—how are we to know what is a "natural" and what an "unnatural" interpretation of Natural Law?

And this leads to the parallel objection: that those who appeal to Natural Law frequently beg the question of what is "natural". If (to take a familiar case) mechanical contraceptives are "contra naturam", what about contraceptive pills? And if these, too, are to be called unnatural, what about their opposite—hormone injections or fertility pills? Indeed, what about anaesthetics, etc? And so we get back to the old and tedious controversy about the scope and criteria of moral theology, in which appeals to Natural Law seem singularly arbitrary.

* * *

These are some of the legal difficulties. And the philosophical difficulties are similar. The linguistic analyst will say: We have two words whose use must be examined. First, "law" may be used thus: (b) as statistical generalisation ("the law of averages"); (b) as empirical basis for induction and prediction with varying degrees of probability, though never with certainty ("the law of gravitation", "the 2nd law of thermodynamics"); (c) as analytic ("the laws of mathematics and logic"); (d) as prescriptive ("the law of the land", "international law"). Unless one already believes in a prescriptive authority for the whole of nature (i.e., unless one is a theist), the "Natural Law" must either be shown to be of the third kind (c—analytic), which is difficult, or it will be of the first or second kind (a and b), which does not carry with it the kind of certainty and infallibility that the concept "Natural Law" is supposed to give. Similarly, the analysis of the word "Natural" will show that *natura naturata* is here being illegitimately transformed into *natura naturans;* that description is being dressed up and passed off as prescription.

And finally, a particular type of "Reformed" theology will join hands with the jurists and the linguistic analysts to oppose Natural Law. There could hardly be a more uncompromising statement of this Reformed position than in a book just translated from the French[2] which was written back in 1946 by the Professor of Law at Bordeaux, a lay theologian of the French Reformed Church.

M. Ellul starts by accepting the positivist historical account of the three-stage development of law. The first stage, religious, the sanctions of the law being upheld by the priesthood, but soon the religious and magical aspects of the law begin to separate from the juridical and moral aspects, and so we have the second stage, the stage of Natural Law. This, in its developed and codified form, we find in the fourth century B.C. in Greece, in the first century B.C. in Rome, in the sixteenth century in Italy, the seventeenth century in France, and the eighteenth century in England and Germany (M. Ellul might have mentioned the late eighteenth century in America, where it had perhaps its most vigorous recent reign). But soon the jurists take this over and rationalise it, and so we get what he calls the phase of "technical law", guaranteed by the state, but removed from human considerations—what is popularly known as "legalism". The length of these stages, he says, may vary:

> It may be stalled by an accident as seems to have been the case with the Aztecs. Or it may be accelerated as seems to have been the case with the Chaldean-Assyrian law which went through a very short phase of natural law and rapidly arrived at the phase of technical law. . . . The third stage was very short in Greek law, Greece having been engulfed by the Roman Empire; it was very long in Byzantine law which survived without any reason.

But what is common to all developments is the fact that the stage of natural law is only a temporary stage, and that the stage of technical law "coincides with the decadent phase in every society".

But having given this picture of the development of law, M. Ellul goes on to show how consonant it is with the Reformed view of divine revelation. For, on the basis of the doctrine of the Fall and of total depravity, the Bible (says M. Ellul) teaches that "Man has no knowledge whatsoever of justice, as he has none of goodness" (p. 87); that all that is not God's righteousness is injustice—"there is no other concept of justice apart from this one (sc. what is in accord with the will of God). Man by himself is incapable of knowing what justice is. . . . Strictly speaking, everything that natural man does is unjust" (p. 40); or again "There can be no study of law outside Jesus Christ; there can't even be human law, however relative, if it is not founded in Jesus Chrust. Apart from him, we shall end up with 'non-law' " (p. 42); or, finally, "This (biblical) understanding of justice radically destroys the idea of objective law and of eternal justice. Law comes into being only by the judgements of God, and these are pronounced according to the

rights of man. There is no secular law. Anything man builds up under the name of law is precisely non-law" (p. 49). M. Ellul's exegesis of biblical passages is not always very convincing; particularly he fails to give a satisfactory explanation, in line with his "barthian" approach, of Romans 2, 14-5:

> When Gentiles who do not possess the law carry out its precepts by the light of nature, then, although they have no law, they are their own law, for they display the effect of the law inscribed on their hearts. Their conscience is called to witness, and their own thoughts argue the case on either side, against them or even for them. . . . (N.E.B.).

He does see that the abandonment of Natural Law has historically often led to tyranny of the *raison d'état,* to the abandonment of all ultimate checks upon arbitrary rule. But he says that this negative reason is not enough to establish Natural Law—all it does is to point to man's sin:

> At this stage in the evolution of law, an attempt is usually made artificially to revive natural law, with the hope of bringing law back to life. This was, among others, Justinian's endeavour. But man is doomed to fail in this attempt. Natural law cannot be revived by the intervention of the state. The relationship between man and law is broken and cannot be renewed by a philosophical or juridical theory. At best, a theory can elucidate the gravity of the problem, but in reality a point of no return is reached. . . . What would be needed is a simultaneous transformation of the inner existence of man, conditioning his adherence to society, as well as of the outside, on the part of the state and of law. But this would spell the end of a whole phase of civilisation. (p. 35).

* * *

It is clear that adversaries of Natural Law are formidable. But unless one accepts the somewhat deterministic views of M. Ellul about social history, I do not believe that a doctrine of Natural Law in some form is so easily demolished; indeed, I believe that some form of it is theologically indispensable, and must be specially precious to Anglicans[3] who hold, with Hooker, that:

> Of law there can be no less acknowledged, than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world; all things in heaven and earth do her homage, the very least as feeling her care, and the greatest as not exempted from her power. (*Eccl. Pol.*, i, 16.)

The most powerful case for Natural Law to have been made in recent years comes in a book whose importance has been strangely overlooked[4]. Its significance is that it is written by a Chinese jurist

who started life as a Confucian, and was only converted to Christianity after study under some of the most eminent legal minds in Europe; he was at one time Chief Justice of the Provisional Court of Shanghai, but when he wrote the book (1955) he was Professor of Law at the Seton Hall University School of Law in the U.S.A. Indeed, a characteristic note of the book is not only his touching enthusiasm for European, especially British and American, common-law principles, but his constant parallels with the teaching of Confucius and Lao-Tse. (He has told the story of his own life and convesion in *Beyond East and West*[5]). His theology is the rather naïve catholicism of the slick "Catholic Evidence Guild" variety, and he appears to attach almost equal verbal infallibility to the toffee-like prose of the papal encyclicals as to holy Scripture.

But the legal sections of the book are of unusual interest, and testify not only to a wide knowledge of western jurisprudence but to a remarkable insight into character, motive and the nature of wise judicial decision. (Most of the cases I have cited above come from this book.) He quotes a class in which a student complained that he didn't see the justice of a decision given in a particular case, to which the Professor replied: "This is a class in law, not in justice." This is perhaps an extreme example of what Ellul calls "technical law"; and it is perhaps peculiarly English. It is worth remembering that a country which has a fixed constitution, like the U.S.A., will tend to exalt the judiciary, i.e., the Supreme Court, to a position of creative interpretation of the Constitution, so that it becomes almost a policy-making body. And this means that the judiciary will need to have a more developed or conscious philosophy of law than in a country like Great Britain where Parliamen, unfettered by a fixed constitution, is the supreme law-giver, and the judiciary can be seen much more as a mere machine for interpreting law. This is no doubt why Natural Law concepts may have survived longer in America than in Great Britain—and, indeed, have re-emerged recently in the Charter of the United Nations. Dr. Wu gives significant quotations from decisions and writings of many of the great American judges from the seventeenth century right down to our own day which show this concern for what is beyond pragmatism—for what Justice Nisbet in 1849 describes as "That naked and changeless equity . . . which is natural—which savages understand—which cultivated reason

approves, and which Christianity not only sanctions, but in a thousand forms has ordained".

But how does this enthusiasm survive the criticisms with which I started? Do "savages understand" anything of the sort? Great Britain has always had a clause in her colonial laws, that Native Law and Custom is to be observed save where they are "repugnant to natural justice, equity and good conscience". But, as Prof. Jeffreys has pointed out, this is usually interpreted as meaning "repugnant to the sensibility of the white man"; whereas "an Anang elder was overheard criticising the law upheld in native and magistrates' courts for being contrary to " natural law" as set down by Abussi" (God)[6].

Well, this is a huge issue, and one can only be dogmatic in a brief reply. But my impression is that anthropologists are less relativistic than they used to be, and more willing to admit common forms (if not common contents) of moral judgement in widely scattered and highly contrasted societies. One authoritative answer can be found in Prof. Max Gluckman's classic study, *The Judicial Process among the Barotse of N. Rhodesia*[7]. He recounts a charming discussion with the local Africans (the Lozi), who questioned whether the, much more primitive, Bushmen living in W. Barotseland "were human beings". One of the Lozi said "No, for they neither cultivate nor keep cattle". But "as soon as I described Bushman marriage and exogamic taboos, and funeral rites, he said: "They are indeed men, with laws of human kind" (p. 207). And Gluckman, after specifying some of the ways in which legal decisions are debated and reached, concludes:

> Generally the Lozi consider that their major laws are *milao yabutu* (laws of human kind). or *milao yaNyambe* (laws of God), and that they embody general principles of morality. . . . They believe that these laws and principles are of themselves obvious and self-evident to all men, even to Whites. SOLAMI [one of the judges] rebuked the Foreign Thief who protested he was helpless as a foreigner in a Lozi court: "My kinsman, we are thus far from partiality because we hold the country to rule it, and the whites find the same right and wrong". . . . Since the Lozi consider that this "same right and wrong" is inherent in the reason (*ngama*) of Man, that it is obvious to and accepted by all men of all tribes and nations, and that ultimately it derives from God, I feel justified in saying that they recognise natural justice—in embryo, the *jus naturalis* itself. (p. 203.)

It is, after all, a striking fact that "The systems derived from

Roman law and the common law of England between them have been accepted by rather more than half of mankind . . . Seeing that the attempts to unify the law are of quite recent origin and extend over a period of not more than 100 years, what has so far been gained constitutes no mean achievement[8]."

And I should like to take another example from what might seem a less propitious area—the U.S.S.R. The politico-ideological foundations of Soviet law are quite unambiguous:—

> The aim of the penal legislation of the R.S.F.S.R. is to protect the socialist state of the workers and peasants and the established order therein against socially dangerous acts (crimes) by applying to persons committing such acts the measures of social defence provided for in the present code. (Soviet Penal Code.)

Or, as Vyshinsky put it:

> Soviet law is the aggregate of the rules of conduct established by the authority of the toilers and expressive of their will. . . .[9]

And yet, in spite of this discouraging opening, most observers of Soviet law in operation have noted the successive moves in a conservative direction over such topics as family (divorce, etc.), small-scale commerce, and the law of torts (accidents); further,

> The U.S.S.R., which in its early years was uncertain whether Marxist doctrine permitted it to recognise a society of States in the traditional manner, has come to indorse with increasing emphasis the traditional conceptions of State authority and State sovereignty, both in its internal and its external aspects—

i.e., the acceptance of International Law[10].

These may seem meagre areas of agreement, and areas of considerable abstraction—very distant from the concrete decisions of daily life in society. Yet the acknowledgement of *law* in these areas is the really significant thing. And here, perhaps, even M. Ellul has more to give us than his negative, revelational approach might suggest. No two books could present a more complete contrast that those of Ellul and Wu, and yet there are strange moments of agreement. At the end of his book Ellul points out that Ezekiel condemned Jerusalem, not only for disobeying God's law, but also for her failure to follow the law of other nations (Ezek. 5, 6-8). "Although inferior to the law of God, this law is still valid, and Jerusalem ought to have submitted to it. This prophecy of Ezekiel supports the validity of human law." (Ellul, p.120). It is not very easy to see how this is compatible with the savage denunciations

of human law earlier in the book: but there it is, and its presence is significant.

But of course it is at best a grudging concession to human necessity, and has none of the lyrical praise with which Natural Law is fêted in writers like Dr. Wu, or even in Hooker, Coke, or Bracton. And if I may end with my own view—my reasons for saying above that a doctrine of Natural Law is theologically necessary—I would say this. It is possible to reach some kind of theological compromise between Catholic and Reformed approaches on this issue (as was done some years ago in a little symposium, edited by Dr. Vidler and Alec Whitehouse), by avoiding 'law' and using terms like 'the orders,' or 'divine norms of nature.' But this compromise will not, I think, give us the kind of glad and grateful acceptance of creation and natural justice, the joy that God has not left himself without witness even where he is not acknowledged, which the profoundest statements of Natural Law affirm for us. If there uan be an 'existential choice of essentialism,' so I believe there can be an evangelical acceptance of 'naturalism.' And I am thinking of those places in the world where injustice cries out for prophetic intervention—and an intervention which, to be effective, cannot be confined to Christians but must come from all those who, however, incohately, can combine in their activity on the basis of 'the natural and moral law.' Seldom has this plea been put more poignantly than in a recent lecture in South Africa by one of the leading jurists there[11]. Prof. Cowan is not only the Professor of Comparative Law at the University of Capetown, but he was the chief advisor in drawing up the recent New Constitution of Basutoland. In this, his Hoernlé lecture, he discusses what is to be the basis of a just order in South Africa—the basis on which liberty equality and brotherhood can be achieved. He considers the replies of the legal positivists, but feels bound to reject them as not matching up to the dramatic demands of the situation. He refers to a great American Judge, Justice Learned Hand, expounding his version of the basis of the American Constitution and its Bill of Rights; and he quotes Judge Hand:—

> I shall ask you to assume with me that the Constitution and the "Bill of Rights" neither proceed from, nor have any warrant, in the Divine Will, either as St. Thomas or Jefferson believed; but on the contrary that they are the altogether human expression of the will of the state conventions that ratified them; that their

authority depends upon the sanctions available to enforce them; and their meaning to be gathered from the words they contain, read in the historical setting in which they were uttered.[12]

And Prof. Cowan comments:

> With respect to Judge Learned Hand, if this view were sound . . . then I would ask you to consider by what possible argument you would deny to the people, at any time, the right to ignore the work of their predecessors, and disregard the constitution itself?

And he finds the only possible answer in a Natural Law which

> postulates the existence of certain unchanging principles of law and justice which can be discovered by man's intelligence, but can never be nullified by his will. . . . Only by seeking to give effect to the eternal values, can there be any strength and hope. . . . That the doctrine of natural law raises difficult issues I do not deny; but men cannot expect to enjoy the decencies of social and political life unless at the same time they are prepared to pay the metaphysical and theological price which these decencies ultimately involve. . . . Those who attempt to assert the rule "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you", as a purely human convention, in fact denature it; and render it impotent against a more strident assertion of human will that might is right. Fortunately, however, in the world today, amidst and the welter and confusion, there is taking place a great revival of natural law study and thinking. This, I believe, is the most exciting and most hopeful sign of our times.

[1] W. FRIEDMANN: *Law in a Changing Society*. Stevens, 1959. p. 285.
[2] JACQUES ELLUL: *The Theological Foundation of Law*. SCM, 1961. 18*s*.
[3] Pace Article XIII.
[4] JOHN C. H. WU: *Fountain of Justice*. Sheed & Ward, 1959. American Edition, 1955.
[5] Sheed & Ward, 1952.
[6] W. R. BASCOM & M. HERSKOVITZ: *Continuity and Change in Africa Cultures*. p. 298. Chicago, 1959.
[7] Manchester U.P., 1955.
[8] M. GINSBERG, in *Darwin and the Study of Society*. Ed. M. Banton. Tavistock Publ., 1961. p. 116.
[9] Quoted in J. C. WU. *op. cit.* p. 43f.
[10] W. FRIEDMANN, *op. cit.* 349.
[11] *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity—Today*. Hoernlé Lecture, 1961, by D. V. Cowan. (S.A. Institute of Race Relations, Box 97, Johannesburg, n.p.)
[12] Quoted from Learned Hand, J., *The Bill of Rights*. Harvard, 1958. pp. 2-3.

Correction, Prism, Oct. 1961, on p. 29, the penultimate line: *for* 245 *read* 745.

Natural Law and Divine Providence (2)

PETER COLEMAN

Anglicans habitually pray at the Eucharist for a godly and quiet government, who would attend to the ministration of justice, the punishment of wickedness, and the maintenance of religion and virtue, but however much we may offer these prayers with an international intention, there are times when this sixteenth-century theology sounds as dated as its language. In what words should we pray for Mr. Hammerskjöld's successor? Does God really want the world to be organised by UNO from the Declaration of Human Rights' blueprint, and is there ever to be a hope of establishing an international rule of law and order which could bring this about?

Professor Hart of Oxford in his new book *The Concept of Law** shows us that some lawyers at least feel they must be concerned with these problems as much as with the precision and certainty of municipal laws. He has written what is primarily a text book on Jurisprudence for Law students, but he has tried to take a broad enough view of legal ideas and problems to be interesting to the general reader, and thinks we might describe his work as an essay in descriptive sociology.

He begins by showing how persistent is the question "what is law"? A few lines on an opening page of an elementary text book will dispose of for example, "what is chemistry", but a vast literature is dedicated to answering the lawyer's question, and he sees behind this search for a definition, three recurrent issues. The first of these concerns the ways in which laws may be distinguished from orders backed by threats. The gunman's orders may be as effective as the policeman's, but we think we have different reasons for obeying them. The second issue arises from the connection which so often exists between the prohibitions of morality and of law, a connection made more complex by the use of the word "justice" to describe the way in which the law works, thus, "justice according to the Law", and at the same time to estimate the value of law itself, as when we speak of just and unjust laws. We are bound to ask, therefore, how legal obligation differs from moral obligation if they are indeed

**O.U.P.* 21*s.*

related. The third issue arises from the practical application of law in terms of rules. Llewellyn, in "the bramble bush" has defined law as what officials do about disputes, and it does appear that a judge's function is to apply rules of law to the facts of different cases, and punish deviations from the rules, but clearly not all rules of society are so treated, and in fact in most cases the judge has to decide for himself whether or not the facts presented to him fall within the rules he has to administer, either by himself or with the help of a jury. It follows that it is possible to doubt whether the rules have any real existence apart from the application of them by a judge, and so we are left asking what are rules, and to what extent is law an affair of rules at all?

Faced with these three issues, Professor Hart suggests that the search for a definition of law is bound to fail because we lack any well-understood category of things into which law can be fitted. We are in the predicament of the man who says "I can recognise an elephant when I see one, but I cannot define it because there is no larger family in the animal world in which its membership can be circumscribed". St. Augustine expressed the same predicament about the notion of time: "What then is time? If no one asks me I know: if I wish to explain it to one that asks I know not". To define law within the general family of rules of behaviour does not help, for the concept of a rule is as complex as that of law itself. If a definition of law is not possible, the instinct which brings the three issues together and seeks for a definition is nevertheless not misguided, for a set of elements in these issues can be isolated which form a common answer to the questions they pose.

The book continues by distinguishing these elements as a primary rule of obligation and secondary rules of recognition, change and adjudication. By the primary rule of obligation is meant the fundamental demand for conformity to those patterns of conduct which are commonly believed by the community to be necessary for its survival or well-being addressed to every member of the community. The secondary rules arise to deal with the problems of uncertainty in the regime, the static quality of the primary rule, and inefficiency in the regime. Thus, there must be a means of ascertaining what the primary rule has been agreed to be, and so the rule may be engraved on two stone tablets and shown to the people, or put on the statute book, or declared at the United Nations General Assembly. In these or other ways it becomes recognised. As conditions change in the community,

so do its rules, and there must be a satisfactory way of recording these changes. The making and repeal of statutes must be made by the authorised body so that everyone knows them to be what they are, and on a smaller scale, such matters as the laws for the transfer of property by conveyance or contract can be seen as the secondary rule of change being applied. Adjudication is needed to empower individuals to make authoritative determinations of the question whether on a particular occasion a primary rule has been broken, and so judges, magistrates and coroners are appointed.

The fascinating way in which this book works these principles out, and develops from them, must be left for those who will read it, but there is in the chapter on law and morals, an immensely interesting re-appraisal of natural law which may be of particular value to Christians who have long hoped for a restoration to respectability of this concept. From Plato onwards, the idea that man ought to be able to discover how to behave by human reason has retained its attractiveness. Aquinas follows Aristotle in holding that a certain order is to be found in those things that are apprehended universally, and that the fundamental principle of natural law is that good is that which all things seek after, upon which all other natural law precepts are based. Grotius, the Hammerskjöld of the sixteenth century, pleaded with the divided nations of the reformation to recognise the fundamentals of natural law to which they were all subject, and ever since, despite the weighty criticism that its contents can never be agreed with sufficient precision to be useful, natural law has never entirely vanished from the jurists' minds.

Professor Hart holds that we can discover elements of natural necessity as salient characteristics of human beings and the world they live in and he lists five of them. They are human vulnerability, which makes necessary the law thou shalt not kill; approximate equality, which makes mutual forbearance and compromise essential; limited altruism which makes us agree to non-aggression, and because some are more limited than others, makes it also unavoidable that non-aggression should be enforced; limited resources, which make some minimal institution of property though not private property indispensable; and limited understanding and strength of will which requires the organising of means of coercion so that those who prefer to meet their own immediate interests shall be prevented from obtaining the advantages of the system without submitting to its obligations.

Whether we call these five natural necessities or natural law, it is clear that they give us a basis very close to the biblical picture of man and the pattern of behaviour God wished for him in the decalogue, a pattern which Christ came to fulfil. It is perhaps the development of these necessities into patterns of primary rules and the establishment of the secondary rules for the whole community of the world by agreement, rather than under another Moses, that should be our present obedience to Christ. Seen in this light, it may be equally valid to interpret recent demonstrations as a public debate about one of the primary rules, and concede that Trafalgar Square and Westminster are more appropriate places for it than Hyde Park and Bow Street.

P. E. Coleman.

FOR VALERIE

Counting the days now, gloriously full,
What can I ask for you?
Freedom at least from body's degradation.
When the great waves rise press shatter
Break you, may you submit,
Knowing from what sea they come.
And when finally quietly they slide away,
Leaving you bare on the exalted shore,
May your soul be smooth as the sand,
Open and smooth as the morning mackerel sky.

And after? Well, Birth is a giving—
Give and take it easy.
Bloom bridal still.
May the marital tiger
And the maternal octopus
Never ravage your peace.
Shawl up your baby firmly with love
To give to his father, Godfather, God,
And they will give back.
This exchange is what I ask for you.

Elizabeth Dixon.

Correspondence for The Times

AN EMPIRE IN DANGER

Sir,

Most historians agree with Gibbon that the decline of the Roman Empire began with Christianity. Far be it from me to give warning that such an influence is upon us again; but I crave your space to suggest that the writing is on the wall.

One has only to look at the widespread habit amongst the young today to live as "lilies of the field"; to "take no thought for the morrow"; to "judge and be not judged"; to dance "as little children"; to "turn the other cheek" in the face of aggression.

Such standards, Sir, are a challenge to us all. Is not now the time solemnly to reaffirm our faith in the Things of Caesar? Nothing less than an imperial effort is required. Where is the shadow of Caligula?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
WESLEY LEATHERHEAD
Vice-Chairman, Anti-spirit Law Enforcement Society.

Sir,

Dr. Leatherhead's timely warning is a clarion to us all. But the danger is not only negative; it is positive.

Today, in the great temples of Mammon—in bingo halls, in stock markets, in offices of consumer research—it is the middle-aged and old who are to the fore. Before we can hope to attract the young back to Mammon, do we not have to ask ourselves if we are not somewhat to blame?

I suggest we have not sufficiently demonstrated to the young the solid advantage of laying up treasures upon earth. The romance of advertising, of expense-accounting, of the take-over bid, should be there for all to see. The Empire is of This World: it is not for nothing that its ruler is called "Prince".

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
THREADNEEDLE STREET
Vice-Chairman, Bingo Emporiums Ltd.

Sir,

Sir Threadneedle Street's timely clarion is a warning to us all. But his suggestion that the middle-aged and old are somehow to blame is misadvised.

Dr. Leatherhead in his original letter spoke of sexual behaviour. For this, as for many other things, all thinking men will agree that the middle-aged are not responsible. I need only quote one statistic to prove my point—that of Pregnancies Amongst Cabinet Ministers Between The Years 1880 and 1960.

Pregnancies amongst Cabinet Ministers 1880-1917	*Pregnancies amongst Cabinet Ministers* 1917-1960
0	0*

*Figure covers period of women's suffrage.

Such figures, Sir, speak for themselves.

Yours faithfully,

ADDAMS APPLE

Vice-Chairman, Society for the Prevention of Pregnancies.

Sir,

I should like to cap Rev. Addams Apple's interesting statistic with a personal anecdote of my own.

My grandfather, vicar of the small hamlet of Llandofopanglorie, was called one day to the door of his church and was asked to baptise the infant child of a couple who were unknown to him. He insisted on satisfying himself first that neither of the parents had had any kind of sexual experience whatever. Only then did he consent to baptise their child.

I can vouch for the accuracy of this story, because I myself was that child.

I trust this anecdote will aptly illustrate the moral of this correspondence.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

A. N. INCUBUS

The Vicarage, Llandofopanglorie.

Sociological Survey

Leslie Harman

Prism has taken the revival of religious sociology seriously and its readers have been kept informed of the recent surveys undertaken on the Continent, in the States, and at home by our own Statistical Unit. In Comment and Correspondence there has been evidence of widespread and lively interest in the terms, methods and apparatus used in these surveys. What I have to report will not, therefore, come as something new to regular readers, though there has been some raising of eyebrows in circles less well prepared.

On 2nd September four Cambridge students came to Shellingford, a small village in the Vale of the White Horse in Berkshire. They came for a week before going on with others to Gloucester and then to Manchester. Through Prism I had heard of their concern for the Church. I had visited them in Cambridge and learned that they wanted to acquaint themselves more adequately with the facts of parochial life, that they might be more informed in discussion and better equipped in service. Believing we could give them what they wanted, I invited them down.

I, too, am new to the district and innocent of the way of life lived by the people. Together with Shellingford I have the care of the villages of Longcot and Fernham; some 600 parishioners in all, well scattered and well assorted. The district is predominantly agricultural though there is a slow infiltration of scientists and technicians from Harwell and the Royal College of Science at Shrivenham, and an increasing daily exodus of men to work in nearby towns. Three churches and multiple services; two schools and the problem of closing one and rebuilding the other; a new rectory to be built; the question of a union of benefices hanging over us; one bus a week between the villages and little community of interest because for business, shopping and leisure activities they look to different towns; no Sunday Schools, guilds or church clubs; no choirs or bell-ringers; no apparatus for teaching or amusement; no Reader or clerical help. Naturally one asks: What material is there to work on and what can be made of it? We planned to spend a week together gathering facts and assessing the potential. It was to be a restricted but practical survey.

RAPID SOCIAL CHANGE

Man in Rapid Social Change

EGBERT DE VRIES

Professor de Vries, Rector of the Institute of Social Studies at The Hague, is recognized as one of the world's leading authorities on the economic and sociological problems of the poorer countries. This book, which was written at the request of the World Council of Churches, is based on detailed studies in thirty countries, supplying a picture of 'Man struggling for freedom, for human dignity, for responsible solidarity.'

November 21*s net*

The Churches and Rapid Social Change

PAUL ABRECHT

The wind of change is sweeping across Africa, Asia and Latin America, involving the majority of the human race in a vast revolutionary movement of ideas and institutions. What has Christianity to say? Above all, what can the churches *do?* The World Council of Churches, in its Assembly at Evanston in 1954, asked for a systematic study of 'rapid social change'. World-wide investigations have resulted in this survey by the American scholar on the World Council's staff who has served as chief executive of the project. *December* 18*s net*

Christians and the Prevention of War in the Atomic Age

This report to the World Council of Churches, and therefore to Christians everywhere, was prepared by an eminent commission of Churchmen, scientists and defence experts under the chairmanship of Sir Thomas Taylor. It examines the moral issues raised by national policies based on nuclear weapons, asking not so much 'How can our hands be clean?' as 'How can we *prevent* the horror which is modern war happening?'

December 3*s* 6*d net*

SCM PRESS

We were invited to broadcast in Christian Outlook on our preliminary findings and for the preparation of the script we sat down round a table and I put questions to each member of the team in turn.

Of Michael Delap, reading History at Corpus Christi College, I asked: What exactly have you been doing this week? His answer was something like this. On the Sunday we attended all the services at the three churches and asked the congregations to help us by returning a few simple facts. To avoid the complication of pencils, some tear-off forms were prepared and what was left after a person had pulled off tabs showed their sex, age-group, marital state and job. There was, in addition, a slip which could be used if that person attended a second service that day either in their own church or elsewhere. By means of a code we were able to note the time and type of service they attended and to trace such movement as there was between the villages. During the week we visited, or were meant to visit, every house and from our inquiries we built up a register of names and the age-groups of all under 21 years of age. We asked about Baptisms and Confirmations and, usually without asking, we got a good deal of free opinion thrown in which we duly recorded on the back of our forms. The evenings were given over to parties of one sort and another. One evening we met the churchwardens and P.C.C. secretaries; another we spent with a Youth Club; two others went to parish parties, in Shellingford and in Longcot. Almost all our meals were taken out in the homes of the people. We had a right good welcome.

Martin Saunders, an engineer at Queens' College, we made our statistician and when I asked him for the findings he presented me with the tables which follow. But before they are read there are one or two additional facts which must be recorded. First, the Sunday on which the returns were made was the last of the school holidays and in consequence the children were conspicuous by their absence; moreover three or four regular families were still away. Second, on that morning between 8 and 10 there was a storm and this caused an electricity failure which threw out the milking times (all-important in a dairying community) and denied most homes their Sunday breakfast. In small and scattered communities such complications can easily make all the difference between a good and an indifferent congregation.

CHURCH ATTENDANCE

	Sex		Status			Age				
	Male	*Female*	*Married*	*Widow*	*Single*	0—11	11—21	21—40	40—60	*Over 60*
Shellingford 8 a.m. ...	5	5	5	1	4	0	2	2	6	0
Fernham 9 a.m. ...	4	8	7	2	3	0	2	1	5	4
Longcot 10 a.m. ...	13	16	15	2	12	1	7	8	10	3
Shellingford 6 p.m. ...	4	5	3	1	5	4	1	0	4	0
TOTALS ...	26	34	30	6	24	5	12	11	25	7

Population of Parishes	*Men*	*Women*	*Children Under 5*		5—12		12—21		*Total*
			B.	*G.*	*B.*	*G.*	*B.*	*G.*	
Fernham	53	53	6	1	7	7	6	15	148
Longcot	92	79	4	6	13	12	14	13	233
Shellingford	41	48	9	5	8	8	9	6	134
TOTALS	186	180	19	12	28	27	29	34	515

THOSE WHO ATTENDED TWO SERVICES

Man	*Woman*	*Married*	*Single*	*Under 40*	40—60	*Farmer*	*Civil Servant*	*Teacher*	*Housewife*
2	4	3	3	1	5	2	1	2	2

	JOB					
	At School	*Further Training*	*Agricultural Labourer*	*Farmer*	*Skilled Technician*	*Shopkeeper*
Shellingford 8 a.m.	1	1	0	1	0	0
Fernham 9 a.m.	2	0	1	0	0	2
Longcot 10 a.m.	7	1	2	6	0	0
Shellingford 6 p.m.	5	0	0	0	1	0
TOTALS	15	2	3	7	1	2

	Civil Servant	*Scientist*	*Teacher*	*Other Profession*	*Housewife*	*Retired*	*Carpenter*
Shellingford 8 a.m.	1	1	2	0	3	0	1
Fernham 9 a.m.	0	0	0	1	5	1	0
Longcot 10 a.m.	0	0	2	1	8	4	0
Shellingford 6 p.m.	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
TOTALS	1	1	4	2	19	5	1

The following table is true only for that day. The figures are extracted from the above tables and the percentages are ratios of those attending church to those of the population in the respective age-groups in each of the villages separately. As has been explained, there could be quite considerable variations on the slightest provocation. It is, however, indicative of one important factor—that of the timing of services.

Percentages	*Fernham* 9 *a.m.*	*Longcot* 10 *a.m.*	*Shellingford* 8 *a.m. and* 6 *p.m.*	*Average*
Children 0-11 years attending... ...	9.5	12.9	4.4	8.8
Children 12-21 years attending... ...	19.0	26.0	13.3	17.5
Adults attending ...	9.4	12.3	11.1	10.6

The services themselves were:

8 a.m. A said celebration.
9 a.m. A said celebration with hymn and sermon.
10 a.m. A said celebration with hymns and sermon.
6 p.m. A sung Evensong with hymns and sermon.

The services at 9 and 10 are called Family Services and they are normally used as such. At the time of the survey there was on alternate weeks a Sung Eucharist at Shellingford. This is now a regular service fixed at 11 a.m.

I then asked Roslyn Atkinson for her comments on the facts. She is a teacher-in-training at Homerton College. Naturally enough she appreciated some of the practical difficulties. There is so wide an age and experience range within the congregations, she said, that any serious and systematic instruction must be almost impossible. The sermons and mode of worship, for example, have to appeal to a top-scientist and a child at the village school. When there can be only one, or at the most, two services on a Sunday there is no chance to specialise and if one tries a something-for-all type of service then it sorely tests both the ability of the parson and the understanding of the congregation. No teacher would be called upon to take a class ranging from beginners aged 5 to sixth form aged 18. No school would attempt an act of worship for such an age spread. This problem is all the more acute in a rural area because country people, unlike their fellow-Christians in the towns, have no opportunity to

worship in St. A's if St. B's is not what they appreciate. And then there is the matter of timing. With so many employed in the twice-daily milking of large herds, not to mention the many other chores about the farms, it is not possible to work a timetable which offers regular worship at convenient times—not in three separated communities. Without private transport a parishioner who has missed, say, the early celebration in Shellingford has either a long wait or a long walk ahead of him. All this understandably strengthens the desire for "a parson of our own" yet not one village could support or use to full advantage a priest of its own, even if he could be found. Nor could the Church afford to leave one man to minister to 200 while his colleague struggles to cope with 20,000.

At this point Barney Hopkinson, reading Theology at Trinity College, came in with his contribution. He triggered off a discussion, the gist of which went like this. There is no doubt that the Church has lost its place in the centre of village life. It's still a part of life as they know it, or remember it. It must be kept open; the parson ought to be there; the whole community complains if the parson has to be shared and there is bitter resentment if the vicarage is sold or the Church school closed. But it's there for their pleasure and convenience. It is most important to note that most use the Church for the occasions of baptism, marriage and burial. There is still that—sentimental, perhaps—attachment. But for them it is no longer the House of God; they never go there to call on their Father; there is no sense of obligation, of duty, even of gratitude. Worship has no part in their lives and no relevance to the affairs of this world. As for the services which are offered—they are not really the spontaneous and heart-felt expressions of thanksgiving for the blessings of the past week or the eager meeting of disciples and Lord; it is hard to see how they could be under the conditions which obtain. Two things seem to stand out clear: first, Sunday ought to be most sacredly observed by all loyal Churchmen. They ought to be in the Lord's House on the Lord's Day. There could be no greater witness than that of the Faithful taking their religion seriously. If the day were set apart and the services really supported, the effect on the congregation and the parson would be tremendous. Overnight the incidental problems of choir and bellringers and grown-ups to sit with the children would be solved. If the congregation were in their places, ready and expectant, when the priest hurried in for his third celebration of the morning, he would experience a surge of renewal and a real stimulation of mind.

In worship and in witness the priest can do no more than his people make possible. The proper observance of Sunday is an obligation we neglect to our peril. But there is the other side too. There is need for a new spontaneity and a fresh adaptability. How splendid it would be if, after the last acre was sown and the last field safely harvested, the people would hurry to the church, picking up the parson on the way, to lead them in prayer and praise, regardless of the day of the week. This must come from the people; from the men whose work and welfare the prayers are to be offered. It is almost meaningless—if not worse—for the parson to organise Rogationtide prayers in the fields of those who openly wonder what parson will be up to next. Sunday is the beginning of the week but can't the other days sometimes be put to use? The liturgical services and offices are there for our use but need we be restricted to them?

As for the shortage of clergy: isn't the real trouble the shortage of Christians? The clergy are only those of the laity who have been called to office in the Church. And there are other "offices" such as that of Reader and, perhaps, a Permanent Diaconate? All confirmed members of the Church have a vocation within the Church. Without long and special training many of the laity can play a far larger part in the worship of the Church, the instruction of the young and the building up of that fellowship which is so important everywhere and particularly in small and isolated rural communities.

There are few parishes which cannot, if they make up their minds, relieve their parson of all duties other than his priestly and pastoral work. They can see that he is properly equipped with the necessary tools for his job—telephone, typewriter, duplicator, projector and car; all of which are generally necessary if he is to do a good job. Above all they can see that he is never burdened with their parochial financial troubles—he'll have enough of his own. It's a poor community that cannot manage its own affairs.

But even then, however substantial and realistic the contribution of the parishioners is, and however ready and willing they are to respond to the ministry of their parson, there is no guarantee that they will get one. Unless there is a shift in attitude there will be fewer coming to ordination and more retiring early. More and more parishes will have to share fewer and fewer clergy.

By this time, as you will have guessed, the whole team was in full cry and one possibility after another was tried out. They were conversant with grouping experiments of one sort and another. In

particular a letter from the Archdeacon of Lincoln, the Venerable A. C. Smith, provided examples for discussion. He, whose own experiment at South Ormsby is so well known, wrote of the Lenton Group (eight churches), the Asterby Group (slightly larger), the Horsington Group (nine churches), the Ropsley Group (five churches), the Greetham Group (seven churches) and such smaller groupings like that at Partney. There is also the new experiment provisionally called a "Neighbourhood Church"; and so on.

The general feeling was that these larger units held more promise than the two- or three-parish union of benefices. (But count me out, said one. I believe that the freehold of the clergy is too valuable to be lightly disregarded.) One does not always get on best with one's immediate neighbours. Often there is no real community of interest. There may even be strong local loyalties. Where more parishes are brought together in a temporary grouping under an experienced incumbent with one or two younger men as assistants and, perhaps, a Reader and/or Catechist to help, there is much more opportunity for all concerned. In this way the assistants get a wider experience; specialists in youth or men's work can exercise their ministry in a more fruitful way; the parishioners benefit from the inter-change of priests and preachers as well as from the opportunities for united work and witness which the association with other Christian communities supplies. Where there is no longer a tied parsonage, the assistants can over the years reside in the different villages so keeping alive at least the possibility of a resident priest. Most of all, for priest and people alike, there is that sense of belonging and of counting which, in an isolated village or a small and unfulfilled union, can become very tenuous.

So much for discussion and the future. In our own small corner we have come to a clearer understanding of ourselves, our needs and our potentials. Rather than write about ourselves—we'll get to it.

A Festival Te Deum by John Alldis and *The Lord's Prayer* from The Mass of the Five Melodies by Patrick Appleford are recorded on CLM 202 published by Josef Weinberger Ltd. (33 Crawford St., W.1.)

Recently published

The Council and Reunion

HANS KÜNG **11/6 net**

Christian unity is of the utmost importance to us all. This book, by a priest involved in the organisation of the next Vatican Council, discusses the way in which our faith demands a change of heart in Catholics in trying to understand other Christians. There may always be doctrinal differences but these are frequently exaggerated by Catholic defence of the indefensible.

Conscience and Its Right to Freedom

ERIC D'ARCY **10/6 net**

A companion volume to *The Council and Reunion*, by an Australian priest, this book examines the question of how far we must act on our moral choices, *right* or *wrong*. The importance of this in making our minds up about the truths of Christianity is obvious.

SHEED & WARD

HUNGER and MALNUTRITION
MENACE MILLIONS of our fellow men

ONE AGENCY FIGHTING HUNGER and POVERTY is the

FUND for HUMAN NEED

Special help is being given to the work of MISSIONARY SOCIETIES in this field

Gifts and enquiries should be sent to the Hon. Secretary, at 34 Eatonville Road, London, S.W.17.

For explanatory booklet, send 1s. 9d.

"I Say, Bishop"

A letter to an unknown bishop-to-be

CHRISTOPHER WANSEY

Congratulations as you go forward to your high office. And congratulations too on keeping your name on the files of the Prime Minister's Appointments Secretary! Like Agag of old, no doubt you have at times walked delicately, because under our present system the files of the Appointments Secretary are in the direct line of the Apostolic Succession. It has behoved you, I expect, on some occasions, to make sure that you kept well within the Civil Service qualities which must rank high with the Civil Servant who makes bishops.

The appointment of bishops used to be a mystery known only to the very few. But now it has been split wide open. Now everyone knows that when the State puts you on the conveyor belt, you pass by easy stages through a mock election, and a visit to the Palace to kiss hands upon your appointment, to your Cathedral consecration. Your consecration is valid, and the Church rejoices to find you in your bishopric, but you will perceive that mingled with her rejoicing is an increasing uneasiness, which comes from the knowledge that it is really the State which has put you there. In fact, because everyone knows this now, it would not be wrong to say that every time a bishop is put on this particular conveyor belt, and is deposited at the door of a cathedral to await consecration, the coinage of episcopacy is debased.

The road you have taken to your "cathedra" was not trodden by the bishops of the early church. Nor is it trodden by any Anglican or other bishop, outside the confines of England. I expect you feel that the end (that is to say, the enthronement of your good self as bishop), justifies the strange secular means by which it has been attained. But Christian ethics frowns on such a proposition. It insists that a good end must be obtained by good means. This is not to doubt for one moment your sterling worth. Probably you are far more brilliant, capable and high-powered than many of us even wish our bishops to be. Is it wrong for us to look for one who will simply be "primus inter pares", one of ourselves, in preference to a person of your outstanding gifts, a Prince indeed of the Church?

The choice of one man as bishop means the not-choice of many others. Some of us have thought that possibly many a good man has been lost to the Church as a bishop because he has refused to reach that office through a Civil Servant, even though he has been so asked.

It is pretty obvious that the present method of bishop-making in the Church of England is on its way out. One effective but self-sacrificing way of speeding its departure would be for all those who are of the quality of bishop (and thank God in our Church today the supply far exceeds the demand), steadfastly to refuse to accept episcopal orders by means of a letter from Whitehall. It would need a few martyrs at first, but the blood of the martyrs has always been the seed of the Church. Might we perhaps have your blood for a start?

You may feel that to say, "Noli episcopari", "I refuse to become a bishop", would lead to a frustrated life. But I need not remind you that a decision taken on a sound principle may indeed lead to a limited life, but never to a frustrated one. On the contrary, if you say (not to the Church, but to a Civil Servant), "Yes, I will be a bishop", you may well run into real frustration. You see, for most of us clergy, the life of our bishop is "beyond our ken". You are on the other side of an "Episcopal Curtain". This is not good. Today, the Church is regaining its ideal of being a real family. The parish priest is much more "one of his people". He has lost his remoteness, and a good deal of "social position" too. But he has gained immensely by finding that his congregation treat him with a friendly familiarity that is most heartening. I suspect that a great deal of this change of attitude has come from the far greater say a congregation has in the choice of their new vicar. If they have very strong feelings, they can exercise a virtual power of veto. Many patrons not only consult the parish first (this they must do if a request is made) but actually do not appoint until they have the approval of the churchwardens.

This is a benefit that bishops should enjoy too!

As a bishop, you will have a gruelling time, far more hectic than that of most of the clergy. But you will also "fare sumptuously". I am not thinking of banquets and county dinners and the like, which are just a natural hazard of high society. Nor am I thinking of the fat pension a bishop gets, three times that of an ordinary clergyman. Though I shrewdly suspect that without the State connection the Church would soon deal realistically with that. No, I am thinking of spiritual fare, of the deference and obsequiousness which besets

a Prince of the Church at every turn, with "My Lord" here, and "Your Lordship" there. He must be a very saintly bishop indeed who can resist feeding his soul at times on such prolific adulation. And where does it come from? We do not find it in the early Church, nor in other parts of the Anglican Communion. It shocks Christians from other countries. And it is only innate courtesy which prevents our Free Church brethren from saying what they think about it.

One does not blame our bishops for this. They are like Daniels, led into an episcopal den where they cannot help but be lionised.

But I wonder if perhaps among the very many benefits that will come with Church-chosen bishops, not the least may be this, that instead of a bishop-image which induces, to put it mildly, a certain diffidence and reluctance amongst the "inferior clergy" and ordinary Christians to approach him, the Church-chosen bishop will often answer his telephone to hear an enthusiastic voice begin a request with, "I say, bishop! . . ."

TRUE HIERARCHY

Our bishops could be worse no doubt. They might not be better if the system were changed. But the gifts and character of individual bishops is not the only point in question. The mode of his appointment affects the *position* of a bishop and even the very nature of his office. When we speak of the Church as a hierarchical body, we do not have in mind the bishop as an autocrat set over and against the diocese he rules. He exercises his office in a hierarchical setting. It comes from above, but so does the whole Church, and he is most true to his office when it is clearly the summit of a pyramid of relations within the Church. This is seen clearly enough in the New Testament itself. One of the most serious defects of the present method of appointing bishops is that it tends to destroy, or at least to undermine, this hierarchical relationship. It is one of sheer autocracy, however much this may be tempered by consultation. The Church as such has no place in this consultation, and this creates a division at the point at which the corporate nature of the Church should be most evident. The apostolic office becomes the centre of conjecture and gossip, and the bishop himself loses something of the sense of being "of" the Church.

from "The Church Observer", Oct. 1961.

Conducted Eucharist

HENRY BURGESS

The main acts of worship in our Parish Church on Sundays are the Family Eucharist at 9 a.m. and Evensong at 6.30 p.m. There is also an earlier Eucharist as well as the Conducted Eucharist at 10.30 a.m., which is described as "the Lord Jesus' Service, conducted and explained, for children, for all who are unfamiliar with the Church's chief act of worship, and for any who cannot come at 9 a.m."

Long before 10.30 a.m. the children begin to arrive, and as soon as the Parish Communion is over, they move into the church. The older ones assist the Servers to prepare the church and put in place the simple nave altar. They are responsible for marking the register, ringing the bell, giving out the books, etc. Each worshipper receives a copy of *The Children's Worship** by Phyllis Graham and a hymn book. The service itself is substantially the same as at 9 a.m., though we never start with a psalm, but always with a hymn. The Commandments, the Invitation, the Comfortable Words, and the Prayer of Humble Access are omitted. The setting is Merbecke and Sanctus, Agnus Dei and Gloria are all sung to it. The Creed is said. The address is as short as at 9 a.m., but delivered much more informally, often the children being taught by the method of question and answer. The Gradual is always the fifth verse of No. 508 (E.H.). There are hymns at the Offertory during the Communion and after the Blessing. The children stand for most of the prayers and only kneel during the Confession, Absolution, the latter part of the Prayer of Consecration and for the Blessing. They are responsible for collecting the alms, and carrying up the Elements. Two boys at a time act as servers each week. There are many helpers to clear up afterwards. The children are given a picture stamp as they leave the church.

What is the background to this service, and is it a possibility in different kinds of parishes? For me and those like myself, who do this service, there is the firm belief that one of the best ways of helping anyone to know and love the Lord Jesus is through teaching them how "to do" it. Hence also the need of doing it regularly every Sunday, and on weekdays as well, when occasion allows, e.g. Maundy Thursday, Ascension Day, and on Saints' days in parishes with a church school. Again, one hears of demands for a service that

* *S.P.C.K.* 1*s* 3*d.* (1951).

will help those on the fringe to come right in and understand the worship of their parish church. What better service could they be given? The Prayer Book can only become understood by those who have been trained in its use, and worship can only have meaning to those who have been taught how to do it.

I know of parishes which are socially speaking very different, but where the conducted Eucharist has come to stay.

There are a few words of warning. One must firmly believe in the necessity of doing it, and not just attempt it as an experiment. It should *not* be started without careful preparation and explanation and much prayer, and those responsible must be most careful in the choice of a conductor. He should be given simple and pithy directions in writing, for his use, e.g. "Stand." "The priest will read the Epistle. Sit." "Let us now own up to God and say we are sorry for our sins." Hymns must be carefully chosen, and occasionally a short hymn practice just before the service begins can be of great use.

I have now been familiar with this type of service for the past eleven years and can state quite definitely that it has had a great affect on the two parishes with which I have been intimately connected with during this time. Adults, who come in with their children, or otherwise, and are themselves unfamiliar with worship, are not embarrassed by not knowing when to stand or sit. The simple instructional address helps them, and if and when they and the children come to the Confirmation Instruction, matters are greatly helped by the amount of knowledge they have imbibed. The small number of lapsed communicants and the large number of young people present at our Parish Eucharist week by week (and sometimes on weekdays) are the direct result of such a service. The idea of doing the Lord's Service has not only been implanted firmly in their minds, but they seem to understand much better what they are doing. The whole parish, children and adults, have become much more missionary-minded. In several cases children have brought their parents back to church, and been instrumental in getting them confirmed.

The regular worshippers invite, and for the first time accompany, any newcomers who are unfamiliar with the Liturgy, to the conducted Eucharist. I have had it pointed out by the faithful that it is now no longer possible for their friends to say, "I don't go to church because I can't understand the service, nor do I know what to do".

They have a very simple answer to such statement; "Come with me at 10.30".

I must add that as soon as the Confirmation classes begin I am most careful to point out that the candidates have now begun to grow up and are expected to attend the Family Eucharist. There are always a few who are unable to come earlier because of a paper round, or some personal difficulties, and these continue to come at 10.30 a.m. We average twelve Communions at this time and this must be carefully watched, for if one was to take too long over the Administration the whole service would be ruined, though it is only fair to add that we had a much larger number of Communicants at my former parish where about three hundred children and adults were present each Sunday. This was dealt with by the Rector and myself both officiating at the Administration.

"We take the case of bishops in 1958, the year of the Lambeth conference. There were 43 archbishops and diocesan bishops in that year in the provinces of Canterbury and York. The average age of 41 of them was 61, and only two were under 50. The Secretary of the Central Board of Finance comments that 'most of the dignitaries of the Church of England—Bishops, Deans, Provosts, Archdeacons, Canons, Rural Deans—are men in the prime of life . . . They are grouped fairly closely round the age of 58.' Perhaps the 'prime of life' has a rather different meaning in Church House from what is normal outside; it is, however, clear that the average age is higher than one would expect to find in comparable occupations outside, whether in business, the Civil Service or the universities. Age explains a good deal. All the 1958 Bishops were born before the First World War, and a large number were educated in that period." *from* "*God and the Rich Society*" (*the Edward Cadbury Lectures*, 1960) *by D. L. Munby, O.U.P.* 25*s.*

Letter from Ghana

ANTHONY HYLAND

I want to begin by describing a scene typical of modern Ghana, which illustrates one particular aspect of the paradoxical nature of the country: one Sunday morning in August 1961, in the Cathedral of the Most Holy Trinity, Accra. The church is nearly full, apart from some reserved pews in the front of the nave: Mattins has just finished, and the congregation, well groomed, affluent and obviously representative of the upper crust of Accra society—ambassadors, company directors, retired judges, government officials and the like, with a handful only of Europeans—is awaiting comfortably for Mass to begin. The customary procession appears from the sacristy and proceeds down the nave to the west door. After the usual delay, the procession returns. But it is not, as one would expect, the Bishop under his ceremonial canopy being led into his cathedral, accompanied by servers in scarlet cassocks, cottas and white gloves: it is a rare visitor, the Manche, traditional ruler and spiritual head of the Ga people, accompanied by his retinue of tributary chiefs and attendants—the Manche attending divine worship as part of the annual Ga Odwira festival. All are sumptuously dressed in rich silks and kente togas, the chiefs wearing coronets of velvet and gold, their right shoulders bare and daubed with ceremonial paint, and their linguists bearing their staves of office, gilded staves topped with crude and barbaric emblems. The company settle themselves in the pews reserved for them, and the service begins. Anglican worship has an exotic flavour this day, and the combination of Edwardian Anglo-Catholicism and traditional West African tribalism is a heady one. The regular congregation, the men dark-suited, the women chic in smart dresses and white straw hats, peer through a forest of upheld staves towards the sacrarium; in the offertory procession, one of the aides of the Queen Mother of Jamestown, elegantly clad in gold silk, carries the bread and wine to the altar; and after the Blessing, the Manche himself is led to the altar to receive an individual blessing from the hands of the Bishop. The congregation, after singing "Christ is our Cornerstone," waits while the Manche processes out of the cathedral to receive the homage of his subjects, several hundred of whom are

waiting in the churchyard outside. The formalities ended, the chiefs and their retinues move off, accompanied by strange bands of drummers and enormous ceremonial umbrellas, out of the churchyard into the town.

Only a few days previously, the Ga had been celebrating the Homowo festival, in which the Manche, as spiritual head, plays a more active role. The chief ritually visits his family mausoleum to appease the spirits of his ancestors; families publicly dispose of their household rubbish as a symbol of cleansing; "kpokpoi" is sprinkled to invoke the aid of the gods for peace and plenty; and bowls, believed to be possessed by the spirits of the gods, are carried in procession by ecstatic women.

This curious conjunction of Christianity and tribal religion is one of Ghana's many anomalies. With the upsurge of national consciousness which accompanied independence, there has been a considerable revival of interest in traditional Akan culture (i.e. the culture of the tribes of Ashanti and Southern Ghana) and tribal religion. In the villages and country districts this is only natural; but among the urbanised and better educated Ghanaians it seems to be rather an expression of emancipation from European rule, of adherence to an ideal of Pan-Africanism. The continuing support for polygamy, even among educated women, is a symptom of the same hankering after tradition: and strange and various are the virtues that I have heard attributed to polygamy. The Churches were recently embarrassed by a Government White Paper on the proposed new marriage legislation: not only is it proposed to legalise "customary" polygamous marriages—which is reasonable in a country where polygamy is traditional—but it is also proposed to make marriage with a monogamous intention (i.e. in which both parties avow a monogamous union) illegal. I cannot tell how much weight the Government has given to the views of the Churches, as the new Bill has not yet come before Parliament; but it is certainly true that the Churches cannot speak with a united voice on the matter. As the Churches enjoy a certain prestige due to the adherence of the tribal leaders (and none more so than the Anglican church, which has pursued in the main a policy of conversion from the top) it is not thought politic in some quarters to offend one's influential adherents by opposing polygamy too vigorously, and opposition is mainly directed against subsidiary proposals concerning rights of inheritance and the legal status of secondary wives. The Asantehene,

for example, Otumfuo Sir Osei Agyeman Prempeh II, the world's most exotic Anglican, although excommunicate, is a conscientious worshipper at St. Cyprian's, Kumasi, and a supporter of charitable causes: naturally the Church would not wish to alienate his affection.

The survival of polygamy is not the only problem facing the Churches in Ghana. With the foundation of the Union of African States (Ghana—Guinea—Mali) and Ghana's adherence to the Casablanca *bloc*, Ghana, with no strong Muslim tradition except in certain areas in the north, is being drawn into the Muslim orbit. It is not surprising that Ghanaian governing circles should regard Islam more favourably than Christianity, concerned as they are to promote Pan-African unity: not only is Islam indigenous in the northern part of the continent, it *appears* so; whereas in Ghana the principal Christian Churches are bastions of a nineteenth-century European culture. Furthermore, recent expressions of Belgian and Portuguese policy in Africa have not increased the appeal of Christianity; when the party press wishes to underline the perfidy of the West, it adds the word "Christian" to its repertoire of derogatory epithets. If the future of Christianity is to be assured in West Africa, I believe that there must be a radical revision of outlook among its adherents; a sloughing off of irrelevant European practices where these are irksome or unedifying, and a renewed concentration on the essentials of the Gospel. Unfortunately, the older school of African churchmen are as conservatively hide-bound as their counterparts in Europe; and what indigenous or miscegenous forms have been introduced (for example, the processional picnic and the dance cantata) are ancillary activities only.

Another influence that the Christian cannot afford to ignore is the Marxist influence, which I expect to grow as Ghana becomes more urbanised and industrial; and although the Marxists are a tiny minority, some are in key positions (for example, men like John Tettegah, Secretary-General of the TUC, and that *eminence grise* Geoffrey Byng, till recently Attorney-General) and they have an effective mouthpiece in the daily *Ghanaian Times*. Fortunately, in the Anglican Bishop of Accra, Ghanaian Christians have a Church leader who is astutely aware of the nature of the opposition, and who places his men accordingly. Less fortunately, he is desperately short of man-power and the funds to support them. In September this year the Government introduced compulsory free primary education; and in a few years time, when the present intake of five-year-olds

have passed through primary school, the Government intend that middle school education shall become compulsory as well. Consequently, the country needs tens of thousands of new teachers, and the burden will largely fall on the Church teacher training colleges if they are able to take it. Unfortunately, the Churches themselves, apart from the well-staffed Roman Church, and some of the less orthodox sects such as the Adventists, are already short of teachers, and the opportunity of opening new teacher training colleges may largely go by default.

Before I close, I would like to mention two morally debilitating aspects of Ghanaian life. The first is the widespread practice of bribery. Ghana's economy is dynamic and expanding, and the ubiquitous bribes, "dashes" and "considerations" do not seriously affect the country's economy (although it is rumoured that in one prominent office block in Accra, a national institution had to bear the cost of a superfluous £150,000's worth of reinforcing steel so that the architect might recoup the bribes he had to pay in order to get the job) but thousands are probably corrupted by the practice. Like adultery, it takes two to commit bribery; and among the most flagrant co-respondents are expatriate business men.

The other aspect is one that the European Christian finds much more embarrassing, and that is the growing tendency to eulogise the President in the language of Christian adoration. This I find debilitating because it inhibits constructive criticism at the political level, and introduces a secular shadow at the spiritual level. And I want to close by quoting from a recent editorial in the *Ghanaian Times*, which will illustrate what I mean:

"A thousand voices will sing in praise of the Redeemer.

> "Oh, for a thousand tongues to sing
> My great Redeemer's praise
> The glories of my God and King
> The triumphs of his Grace."

"Yes, a thousand voices will sing
Sing the praise of Africa's great Redeemer
Sing the glories of the great Messiah
Who returns today, in triumph
From a mission of peace, over the seas. . .

"We believe, too that Osagyefo will come with a message that

will sooth the hearts and souls of all his peoples, and recharge our energies for the great task of Socialist reconstruction.

We take the lead in offering our salutations to the great Messiah. . .

"Kwame, we shall serve you!

Kwame, we shall forever be loyal to you and through you, to Ghana and Africa!"

The population of the City on Sundays is not large and these buildings must therefore justify their existence by the service which they provide on five days in the week for the workers who, for one reason or another, cannot find what they are looking for in their parish church. From Monday to Friday therefore the competition is intense—so intense indeed that, as far as I can discover, none can attract a regular congregation of more than 120. The average congregation at the main weekday service is about half of this.

The decision to keep the City churches open—or in some cases closed for repair—rather than to sell them is one of cash. It just is not possible to pay lighting, heating, incidental repairs, and caretaker's wages out of what the average City church is taking in collections and leave anything over for the propagation of the Gospel. The result is that these churches must, from time to time, receive massive support from diocesan or other sources while all the time locking up a capital sum (the value of the site) to say nothing of benefice income, for which the housing estates in the new industrial areas are crying out. If architectural considerations are really felt to be overwhelming, the site-value of many of the bombed churches (five are being *re-opened* shortly after massive resotration) could surely pay for their removal elsewhere stone by stone? If it is felt that a certain number of clergy ought to be maintained in London for national and diocesan purposes—fair enough. They could be accommodated in offices. But in *churches? Forty* of them? Surely such a decision or lack of it does not represent the heart and mind of the Church.

(*Reprinted from "What's wrong with the Church?" by Nick Earle. Penguin Books 2s. 6d.*).

Counsel and Consent

The Bampton Lectures for 1960

E. W. Kemp **27s. 6d net**

A history of the Two Convocations of Canterbury and York from the earliest times to the present day. Authoritative, fully documented, and lucid, they set out the story of the development of self-government in the Church parallel with the development of parliamentary democracy in England, and illustrate pointedly the special difficulties and opportunities that arise as a result of the Establishment.

P. E. T. Widdrington

Maurice B. Reckitt **18s. 6d net**

P. E. T. Widdrington was a man of many parts, and few significant movements in the contemporary Church are without the influence of his profound and passionate zeal for social justice, or his desire for the consecration of the arts in the service of the Gospel. Maurice Reckitt, who has written this account of his life, was one of his colleagues in the Christendom Group, as was Canon V. A. Demant whose sermon at his Requiem is included in the book.

A Priest's Notebook of Prayer

The Priest's Library

J. H. L. Morrell **9s. 6d net**

The Bishop of Lewes "has tried to keep in mind the ordinary parish clergyman, always at the mercy of unexpected interruptions and calls", and to provide him with a book of prayers and advice about praying which he can carry about with him and use in odd moments of the day.

S · P · C · K

Two Worlds of Leslie Paul

NICHOLAS MOSLEY

Leslie Paul is an extraordinary phenomenon. Born in 1905, brought up in London, his father a seller of advertising space for magazines, he left school at fourteen and worked as a clerk, got into journalism by editing a Scout magazine called *The Open Road*, started his own successful Scout movement called The Woodcraft Folk, became an organiser of left-wing politics and trade unions during the General Strike—all at an age when boys of his talents but from different backgrounds were still at Oxford or Cambridge. At twenty-eight he had a physical breakdown (he wrote "For ten years I had done enough to exhaust half-a-dozen men—writing, arguing, organising, presiding, speaking at street corners, pamphleteering, electioneering, travelling—all in order to tell people how to run the world. As if I knew!") This happened after a visit to Russia, in which he noticed "the contradiction between the fervour and energy devoted to socialist reconstruction, and the unhappiness to be divined wherever one scratched the surface". Disillusionment increased during the middle thirties when he visited Germany and saw what use had been made there of Youth Movements which had once been similar to his own—the back-to-nature mysticism of the twenties having evolved into a mumbo-jumbo of fear and violence. When the war came, having been a pacifist, he at once joined the army ("the war became for me a test of my manhood which I could not reject") and in the idleness of army life set about wondering what he could now believe. In 1940, at the age of 35, he returned to the faith in God that he had abandoned in early childhood. All this he describes in his autobiography *Angry Young Man** —a book as fluent and intense as the events it is describing.

This is a more important story than just that of one man's spiritual search. The generation to which Leslie Paul belongs—those who missed the first war, who grew up into the chaotic twenties, who found themselves landed in the thirties when anyone who cared about anything had to care about politics—were driven almost inevitably towards either Communism or Fascism. In the amorphous world of hunger, apathy, and the misuse of power, most young men with a conscience toyed with left-wing politics, and looked towards

* Faber and Faber, 1951. 18/-.

Russia for hope. Then they either visited Russia, or perhaps Spain, and they came across the realities of communist politics, and were disillusioned. Many could not admit this (the veterans of Spain hanging about like ghosts); many did admit it, but did not know what to do. It was not easy to know what to do when, in 1940, Russia made its pact with Germany, and the real war started but with all their categories in confusion. Many did not have the courage to go back and start again.

Leslie Paul did. What helped him was his care and curiosity, which is itself a form of courage. He describes in *Angry Young Man* how as a boy he bought a copy of Richard Jefferies' *The Story of My Heart* and there discovered "a burning, almost anguished sense not just of the glory but of the transparency of the world . . . The agitation certain passages aroused in me was so great that I never dared read in company lest I had to cry out . . ." This feeling remains throughout his later writings. He has a passionate sense of wonder, of his involvement in the world and need to understand it. This quality not only saves a sensitive person from despair by giving them something to do; but gives them hope, because what they discover is that the world *is* wonderful.

From 1940 onwards Leslie Paul has written two series of books, one of which tells of his personal history up to 1940, and the other of his subsequent explorations into new ideas. The autobiographical books (apart from *Angry Young Man*) are of childhood: they are full of the strangeness, movement and distractions of childhood. They are well written and evocative.

Of the books of ideas, the first of them, *The Annihilation of Man**, was an attack on the limitations of the material-scientific view of the world and an exposure of Marxism and Fascism. These latter chapters were especially valuable, as they pointed out the flaws in these two systems which make them appear not only wicked (which is a matter for argument) but ridiculous—Marxism being concerned with a prophetic belief about what should be happening in the world which is different from what is actually happening in the world (so that Marxists are in the position of adventists who wait on top of a mountain and then have to come down again); and Fascism, for all its talk of glory, being dependent for its energy on a mystical involvement with death. These were original insights in 1944.

Next there was a work of Christian apologetics, *The Meaning of*

* Faber and Faber, 1944. 7/6.

Human Existence (now out of print); then *The English Philosophers** (1953), an account of "empirical" philosophy from Pelagius (!) to the logical analysts; *Nature into History*† (1957), an excursion into pre-history, anthropology and the origins of language; and now *Persons and Perception*‡, published this autumn, in which he returns to philosophy and continues his battle against the inadequacies of empiricism, and suggests further enquiries into the nature of consciousness along lines started by Whitehead.

I am not qualified to judge the philosophy of these philosophical books. It seems to me they are the result of wide and intelligent reading; but their style, which is difficult, will not make philosophy easier for those who cannot stomach the jargon, and may not be acceptable to professional philosophers who are careful about guarding their magic language. (They have to be: like art critics and spiritualists, their job is to describe the indescribable.) Also, the aim of much of Leslie Paul's philosophy seems to be to invalidate the traditional obsessions of philosophy—a process which is nowadays undertaken by professional philosophers themselves (see Professor Ayer's *The Problem of Knowledge*) but which none the less makes uneasy reading. The penultimate sentence of *Persons and Perception* is, for instance—"a kind of urgency must thrust one on . . . ultimately to leave the narrow field of the perceptual problems of the person, for those which take up Being in its widest sense". This is an urgency that the reader feels himself.

The impression given by all these books is of the enormous energy once concerned with "telling people how to run the world" now turned to finding out about the world—to assimilate everything relevant in the way of history, philosophy, science. There is something heroic in this switch—in the beginning again, the unflagging interest. But just as in the autobiographical books there is something missing at the centre of activity, so there seems something still missing at the centre of thought. Leslie Paul only writes of himself up to the time of his conversion; after that, he writes mainly of his discoveries of other people's ideas. There is still the search; the covering of huge areas of obscure and difficult country. But there is no report of what has been found; no personal voice from the stillness.

His latest book, published a fortnight after *Persons and Perception*,

* Faber and Faber, 25/-.
† Faber and Faber. 21/-.
‡ Faber and Faber. 25/-.

is called *Son of Man**, and appears to be a life of Christ. Here, one would think, is a subject about which the author would have to speak from stillness; the one area of history where the whole boiling morass of the world comes to rest.

But *Son of Man* is not a life of Christ at all, it is a life of the times and peoples around Christ—of the Romans, Jews, Greeks, Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, soldiers, tax-gatherers. All this is described with the usual accuracy and *verve*; but the figure at the centre of it all is hardly there, or is described in a few quotations from the Gospels. There is a great value in having just the surroundings of Christ's life thus presented: the Gospels are at the other extreme from *Son of Man* in that they illuminate so strongly the stillness and timelessness of Christ that the chaos around him is often in darkness; and there is a need to be reminded just how meaningless was the world into which the redeemer came. Leslie Paul is the right writer for this job: he has great talent, as has been seen, for mapping areas of organised chaos. But as far as the writer himself is concerned, the search, and the restlessness, continues.

It is perhaps churlish to take this lack of a resting-place as a criticism. PRISM has often exhorted Christians to stop being obsessed with themselves and to become passionately curious about creation. Well, Leslie Paul has done just this; and has done it with success and intelligence. Also perhaps he suspects what many writers suspect: that if he ever got there—to a place where an understanding of the infinite would touch the chaos so that it would cease—then there might be little to say and nothing to write about. But this is unlikely to happen to most of us. And in the meantime there is the need (going parallel with the search outwards about the world—not contradicting it nor going away from it, but each being dependent on the other) of the search inwards, into stillness, for the authoritative statement, for words that do not grope but ring bells of change and effect. There should perhaps be a time for all Christian writers to attempt this—to state their knowledge of the world in terms of what it means to them as persons. Perhaps Leslie Paul's two worlds —that of autobiography and that of ideas—should soon (like parallel lines in infinity) try to meet.

*Hodder and Stoughton, 21/-.

One Chaplain's week

Simon Phipps

(*written in* 1954 *when the author was Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge, and reprinted by kind permission of Granta*).

What do they think one does, anyway? Well I mean to say, really. . . . They haven't an idea, the dear boys. Not an idea. Maybe that's why they asked.

I mean, here I am on Saturday morning, so I may as well start there. And look at my writing table. There's one Chaplain's week for you. Only there's a week's worth for five Chaplains. So Saturday.

Well, everybody starts the same. Chapel [the porter came in yesterday—that was Friday of course—before *Matins* and put all the lights out and there was I all alone at the other end of the Chapel in the dark. So I shouted (sorry, but I had to), and he said "Sorry" too and put on rather more lights than before and went off on tip-toe], and then breakfast. And Otto is still going? Otto is my new stove and he makes all the difference, and never goes out, and eats dust like the Serpent in *Genesis*, only he never did anything wrong—so far. He has a card which says, "All you need to know to get the best out of your Otto". I'm sending it next Christmas to the Archduchess. I have two very nice bed-makers, Mrs. Kirby and Mrs. Philpotts who make my bed and never break my china. They hum around while I eat, bless them. Why don't the kitchens know about boiled eggs? They never hit them on the head; so they go on boiling all the way from the kitchens and up the stairs here, and are hard on me by the time I look inside. There's *The Times*. I miss all the news, because I only read *The Times*. The things other people know about, who read other papers! Still I do know that the old Surrey and Burstow Hunt Ball was held last night at the Selsdon Park Hotel and that Captain R. M. Wayo has been appointed to the Admiralty's Underwater Weapons Department. Hurrah! And Mrs. Wayo will be *so* pleased. And small Wayo at school: "*My* pater's . . ." How proud. I can see the Captain in trunks and goggles and flippery feet and a spear, but perhaps it isn't that. But look here . . . this week is passing. Still, the thing is a parson *must* read the papers, that's what I always say, I mean, if one didn't know about the Old Surrey

and Burstow Hunt Ball they'd say: "*There* you are. *Out* of touch. No *idea* about *life*." And they'd be *right*.

Letters, at breakfast too. And here they all are now on my table. Same every morning. So this is really all *one week*. You must think of it as a whole, a unit . . . You know, as I imagine natural scientists probably say. (Unnatural scientists, now they *are* interesting . . .).

But letters, Now you wait. This'll open your eyes. "About your invitation to take the Retreat for Girl Guides in April . . . ", "Yes, I will certainly put up the Reverend George A. Parkins of the Geneva Work Camp staff of the World Council of Churches and . . .", "I'd love to baptise the baby. When? Do you remember how quick I had to be with John because the font was leaking? And those camelias round the edge that *would* fall in. No camelias this time, please", and "I'm so sorry to hear about your mother's feet. She really does have a . . .", and "So sorry. I can't preach on the Women's World Day of Prayer (I did once, though, and it was the 29th February too. There were 1,000 women, but none of them noticed), "The Reverend ——— thanks ——— and regrets that he will not be able . . .", and "I have known Miss Enid Bott for the past three years. She was a very regular attender at our Parish Church and I can recommend her as being thoroughly . . .", and "I wish I could come as Chaplain for the Diocesan Sunday School Teachers Summer School but I am glad to say I shall be taking charge of an international group of students, building a church in . . ."

And quite apart from all that there's my sermon for Sunday. Now let's see . . . Telephone: "Hullo. Oh *Hullo*. Yes do. In half an hour? Certainly. No, of course you won't be. I shall be delighted. Stay for lunch?" One must be *available*. Now let's see . . . "Come in. Push hard. That's it. Oh Hullo. Yes do. No, sit down. Switch on the fire. Pace is so hot this morning, I never . . . " (I didn't continue because he didn't see the joke. Now aren't people odd? I mean . . .) "Nestorianism? Ah! Nestorianism! Eheh! ye-e-e-es. Cigarette? Well of course there's Bethune Baker. Oh, you have. Oh. Explain Bethune Baker? On Nestorianism? Ah! Bethune Baker on Nestorianism! Eheh! ye-e-e-es. Have an ash tray. Well of course . . ."

Eventually back to the sermon. Now, let's see . . .

Afternoons, it may easily go on just the same, except for the hard-boiled egg. Lunch, you see. Well, we do have some *funny* things but not hard boiled eggs.

Or open air, if one's lucky. Perhaps showing someone round. "That's where Byron . . . And *d'you* know the water in the fountain comes . . . We feed in here. Doesn't it smell *delicious*?" Or the river. No, not *on* the river; on the *bank*. Running . . . madly . . . and being tremendously in it all with the chaps and everyone, because they do like it so . . . and shouting . . . and being knocked over by coaches on bicycles, which makes one shout even louder . . . and that's marvellous 'cos one never could have otherwise, really . . . and they've WON! HURRAH! Who? Oh, the others, oh well . . .

And tea for twenty-two, which is a marvellous way of getting to know undergraduates (who has sugar and so on). And Evensong and the people who accentuate the wrong words in the psalms: "And *my* moisture is like the draught in summer", "They *have* made Jerusalem a heap of stones." And Hall. One shyly asks the Fellow next to one what he is (we have so many you see, one couldn't know yet) and it doesn't help at all. Nuclear Masochist (or that's what it sounded like) and so on. And after Hall anything may happen until bed-time. At least anything except bed-time, and then it's time to start all over again, week after week.

"Sin", I understand, is the name given to a particularly striking and exotic perfume, presumably chosen as an old-fashioned word for what contributes to the enjoyment of an evening. This is a setting for the word "sin" which makes the communication of doctrines of sin and atonement hazardous in the extreme, and reminds us of the constant need in apologetic to be alert to, and to make plain, the contextual setting of doctrinal terms.

from "On Communicating Religion" by Ian T. Ramsey. (*The National Society.* 1*s.*).

Comment

Valerie Pitt writes:

The debates on Lanka were not, the *Church Times* says, acrimonious. This is true, but there are diseases of debate which are worse than acrimony. And there are ways of making policy which make party strife look like the innocence of Eden.

Everyone is disturbed by the muddle and confusion of the Lanka affair. The attempt to get a straight *yes* or *no* decision on a complicated theological issue, and to get it quick, was not edifying. Neither was the defence of ambiguity. What point is there in a unity based on a conscious misunderstanding of other people's terms? But the most interesting and perhaps the most dangerous feature of the affair was the part played in it both by the present Archbishop of Canterbury and by his predecessor.

The Archbishops asked Convocations to advise them about the Church in Lanka. They *asked* for consultation but no one listening to them could have any doubt about the advice they wanted and expected. It was not the advice they got, and the absurdity of the situation raises the whole question of the Archbishops' voice in the synods of the two Provinces. Archbishops are not in our Church infallible sources of discipline and doctrine. They are *primus inter pares*. And by virtue of this primacy they are the Presidents of their Convocations. The Archbishop acts as Chairman to the Convocation when it meets in full synod, and is automatically Chairman of the House of Bishops. He has, in fact, the functions both of the Prime Minister and of the Speaker of the House of Commons. This is a position which is neither good for the Church nor for the Archbishop. Lord Fisher made a great use of it. In his day Convocation often, too often, met in full synod and, as Archbishop, he was its Chairman. He was, in one sense, a very good Chairman: that is, he was extraordinarily skilled in managing the house. But he did not, I think, contribute much to the freedom and flexibility of Anglican discussions. Indeed his frequent intervention in debates set an unfortunate precedent which we hoped the new Archbishop would ignore.

Dr. Ramsey does not behave with that open zest for managing affairs which distinguished his predecessor. On the contrary he was not, he said in his Presidential address to Convocation, intending to

press his own "lines of preference" (I wish his Grace would watch his metaphors). But no one in Convocation could be in any doubt as to what those preferences were. He favoured communion with the Church in Lanka: he did not favour the North Indian Scheme. Now the Archbishop is far from naïf. He must know that a statement of the Chairman's preference made before a discussion carries considerable weight, especially when that Chairman is also an Archbishop. What is more, in this matter Dr. Ramsey's influence is probably greater than that of his predecessor. The Archiepiscopal authority is reinforced by the authority of the theologican. It is true that Dr. Ramsey is a Biblical not a dogmatic theologian; in questions of the validity of orders and of rites his scholarship must yield, say, to that of Dr. Mascall, or of Professor Ratcliffe. But when an Archbishop exhorts his clergy from a privileged position in which, by the rules of civilised discussion, *he cannot be contradicted or argued with*, the validity of his opinion, and the limits of his learning, remain unquestioned. And it says a great deal for the integrity of the Lower House that, in spite of the confusion, and in spite of the pressure of the Archbishop's known views, it followed its own line.

The dilemma is a very real one. Dr. Ramsey's theological talents are too great to be lost in the silence of a neutral chairmanship. But the appeal of one of the Proctors to the opinion of the Archbishop *as Archbishop* does show that these talents may very well inhibit theological debate. There would I think be a strong case for appointing a Speaker to the Convocations, so that the Archbishop would be left free to act as Prime Minister and to play a proper, that is a debating, part in the discussions of the House. But in any case, if Archbishops ask for the advice and counsel of their synods they should make quite sure that that advice and counsel is freely discussed and openly given.

R.D. writes:

Bishops apparently have two choices about cars. They either own their own or the Church Commissioners give them one. But if they run the Church Commissioners' one they have to give it back when they retire, and also it has to be a black Rover. Now black Rovers are fine cars but the thought of bishops running all over the country in them produces a somewhat monochrome image. One bishop, opting out of the Rover-embrace, has bought a bright scarlet Ford and now notices, when talking to Teddy-boys and other car-

connoisseurs (most of the population in fact), that even if his talk passes straight over their heads, his car makes a visual impact, then a talking point and eventually a change of episcopal image. Out of such simple expedients come surprisingly large results. Other PRISM-reading bishops please copy.

C.M. writes:

I was recently spending a weekend in a South Coast watering place. Besides Methodist, Baptist and Congregational chapels (not the sort to call themselves churches) that still trail clouds of glory, it boasts an Anglican church and three C's of E. I was in the parish of one of the latter, and on Saturday evening about six went on a reconnaissance. It was shut. I fumed for a bit, meditated appealing through these columns for a black-list of all shut churches, then set about studying the notice-board. The list of services mentioned a prayer-meeting later that evening, at a time I could not manage, to be held (why?) in the choir-vestry. At least that would mean opening the church, so I took three breaths and went and asked at the Vicarage if I could borrow the key to go into the church for a few moments. The Vicar eyed me narrowly, and his dog growled. Still, he let me into the church, but kept an uneasy eye on me from a slit in the vestry door. Perhaps I look sinister, but any Vicar who keeps his church so firmly shut strikes me as equally criminal. I've not checked my statutes or canons, but since Cranmer laid on daily Morning and Evening Prayer as a norm, it's just possible that "criminal" may somehow be technically accurate.

* * *

On that notice-board something else caught my attention. It was an invitation from the Free Church Council of the town addressed to choirmen of the local "evangelical Churches of England" to form a united choir for open-air services. The Anglican church was implicitly excluded, though it's not very high, nor its Vicar the least bit spiky. The unity of the intended choir therefore seems sadly deficient, and what the town clearly lacks is a properly constituted branch of the British Council of Churches, which will get its strength by getting everyone from Quakers to Anglo-Catholics to do things together.

* * *

Certainly the one branch I know has in its twenty years achieved a good deal. You may laugh at its range of concern from local

road-safety to refugees, and a casual visitor to its thrice-yearly full meetings might well call them trivial and tedious. But it does bring Christians of different allegiances together, not just for platitudes or tea, but to set in train some worthwhile activities, like marriage counselling and good relations with the local press. It is unquestionably ten times more valuable than a ruri-decanal conference, which so often embodies the Church of England at its stuffiest and most unproductive. Not the least justification for jamborees like New Delhi is the way they set up goals for local Councils of Churches to aim at.

A Correspondent writes:

"A former curate" has reported in the *Church of England Newspaper* his experiences with accommodation during his first curacy and has made good resolutions about how to deal with his future curates. This begins "I will not entertain thoughts of engaging a married curate unless I can provide him with suitable accommodation".

An enormous number of curates have suffered from this and other problems like it. The most essential thing is that, whatever the conditions may be, the future curate should know exactly what they are before he accepts the position. It is only natural for incumbents hoping to get a curate to paint the bright side of the picture and it is also only too easy for genuine misunderstanding to creep in. "But you *said* I would have . . ." "Oh, but I *meant* if it was available." Then each side starts reckoning that the other is not behaving in a truly "Christian" way and the relationship is off to a very bad start.

It is not "spiritual" to be unbusinesslike in contractual relationships. Terms of service should be set out in black and white with every T crossed and every I dotted so that there is no possibility of misunderstanding.

Calendars and Christmas Cards by Dame Laura Knight, John Piper and Hyman Segal can be obtained from *Christian Action*, 2 Amen Court, London, E.C.4.

Letters

DEMYTHOLOGISING

Dear Sir,

I have been fortunate enough to spend two years in a theological college, a privilege that few have. I found these years basic to the formation of my thought and relationship to the world. During the last year, the issue of "Demythologising" was imposed upon us as the solution to modern religious problems and was thrust upon us in every sense of the word as a system. Such a view of "Demythologising" I am sure, is ultimately contrary to the existentialist understanding of Being. Now that I have been able to read more of the work of Bultmann, I am sure the attitude adopted was contrary to the work and intention of Bultmann himself. The "system" was put over deaf to the fact of the dialogue that is ever-increasing in Europe and America, and hence greatly impoverished and even muddled. The essence of study surely is always to be aware of the dialogical synthesis of thought that can never, by its very nature, solidify itself into a concrete system.

The purpose of this letter is to bring attention to one aspect which greatly distressed many of the students of the college during my stay. Many felt that the Gospel had been reduced to a form of "contradictory existentialist gnosis", and that there was no room for the traditional understanding of the Church's images necessary during centuries for proclamation and communication. (I remember well a sermon in a class being ruthlessly exploded. The sermon that the student had prepared was for Advent Sunday. It was a good traditional understanding of the Last Coming, but it had not been "Robinsonised" enough to satisfy the accepted norm!) The targe images of the Church are in Jung's words, "symbols of transformation", and are still dynamic for many people today, capable of changing a person's whole life. Furthermore, many people still find devotional satisfaction in them, and can happily think of the Ascension without fear of a collision in space between Our Lord and a Sputnik! It is my humble opinion as a layman, that it is an unwise policy to send out "demythologised" ministers from a theological college, for the short time spent today in preparation is not enough for a person to digest the immense amount of thought

that has been, and is being, written with all its implications in the many fields of study. I am thinking particularly of psychology. I am sure many of us left college more confused than ever before in our lives, and enough confused and badly digested thought is inflicted upon our congregations from the pulpit as it is. I have become greatly aware of this since I have returned to the practising ranks of the order of laymen.

There is only one aspect of the problem that I wish to refer to here, simply because I consider it of vital importance to the health of a Christian's understanding of his Faith. I refer to the Resurrection and the problem of the Empty Tomb. To believe in the Empty Tomb was frowned upon as if one accepted for an image a concept rather like a Hollywood film of the Crossing of the Red Sea. In fact, it is right to liken the Resurrection to the Exodus. Martin Buber has shown in his dedicated work how the Hebrew Community is ingrained into this experience. No practising Jew, I am sure, would deny that this is in fact fundamental to their understanding of the very essence of Time, that is, chronologically and kairologically. This was something that a people experienced with the wholeness of their lives. The Exodus is a Thou and an It. The Exodus was also a sign that changed the relationship of a particular people to their God . . . the Eternal Thou encountered and met His People in chronological time. Another example can easily be Isaiah's "theopolitical" hour. Biblical scholars can think up a hundred and one reasons why the Assyrian troops suddenly retired, but the fact remains for those who had eyes to see and minds to understand that this historical event contained the Eternal Thou for the Chosen People. Surely the Resurrection must contain something of the same historical matter-of-factness, regardless of the confused reports in the New Testaments. Something happened at the Exodus and at the "theopolitical" hour of Isaiah which was more than just a subjective experience. The event was essentially objective as well, but only a few had the eyes to see and the grace to understand.

To take the insights of "Demythologising" and build them up into a system, so as completely to remould our theology, is surely in the last run to achieve a position of "reductio ad absurdum", and to abstract ourselves completely from the essence of our Faith. We are left with nothing more than an intellectual orgasm understandable to the few who have reached the heights of such perception. To "demythologise" is something that every man does in relation to

another. This is not of necessity a highly systemised intellectual process, because ultimately the *concrete reality* that one has attempted to communicate in dialogue to the other becomes real only through our unique personal relationship to the world ("But this is the exalted melancholy of our fate, that every Thou in our world must become an It"). Many, however, will acclaim the same salvation, though the coming to that reality must be different and unique to each person. This is the richness of the dialogue of humanity and no one can "boil it down" to a system. If one does, is not one dangerously near to idolatry?

I am grateful to Professor Maurice Friedman in helping me to understand the depths and implications of the work of Professor Martin Buber concerning the many many problems that face man in our vital century.

Yours truly,

Dorking. JOHN S. ALLITT.

TEACHER TRAINING

Dear Sir,

Your commentator R.M.'s obiter dicta about the training of teachers, thrown off in the course of sympathetic remarks about the teaching profession as a whole, give a poor idea of us folk in the training colleges. Maybe we are bad, but not bad enough to justify: "The two (now raised to three) years spent there are almost a complete waste of time—complete except for the six weeks actual teaching practice". Surely this is harsh.

Our standard of entry is not so high as we should like since many sixth formers go to universities rather than to training colleges if they get the chance, but not low enough to justify the bald statement: "Teacher training colleges ask ridiculously low qualifications, fail very few on interview. . .". If I may quote this college, which is about average in this respect, I have made the following analysis of passes at Advanced level over and above an average of seven passes at Ordinary level for the last intake.

Number of intake 174.

Students with	5	passes	at	Advanced	level		...	...	1
,,	,,	3	,,	,,	,,	,,	...	...	28
,,	,,	2	,,	,,	,,	,,	...	...	57
,,	,,	1	,,	,,	,,	,,	...	...	44
,,	,,	0	,,	,,	,,	,,	...	...	44

These figures are not ridiculously low, though they are low enough.

Another of R.M.'s statements is completely at variance with the facts. He says: "There is no outside examination or anything approaching a university board". Has he never heard of the University Institutes of Education in which the training colleges have been constituent members now for over a decade, and which are in fact responsible for conducting examinations, giving the appropriate award and recommending successful students for Qualified Teacher status?

R.M. betrays an attitude to training colleges formed generations ago and accepted by the uncritical without any examination of contemporary evidence. We often hear this expressed, though not often so blatantly, and there is a stock reply: Will you come and visit us for a few days and see what is really going on? If R.M. accepts this invitation, which I cordially extend to him, he may discover why some of us feel that in the training colleges we are at a significant growing point in education.

Yours faithfully,

P. J. LAMB

Principal, St. John's College, York.

CONDITIONAL ORDINATION

Dear Sir,

I quite agree with Mr. Fletcher (PRISM August) that inward graces, resulting (by grace) from "tolerance and prayer" will be necessary if re-union ceremonies are to be of value; and I am sorry if I seemed to imply less. But when he speaks of putting Anglican orders right by "ordination" (I did, indeed, deliberately avoid the word), I still do not think that he has seen the real problem.

First, let us remove a false argument. The fact that Anglicans have not doubted Roman orders, whereas Romans have doubted Anglican, is not relevant unless the actual problem (i.e. are Anglican orders valid?) is simply ignored. For if Anglican orders *are* valid, then all that it means is that in the years following the Reformation the English Church at least managed to remember her manners about orders, whereas the Roman did not; and that is no reason why the English should now apologise.

Still, it is not unseemly, within the Christian mystery, for an injured party to submit; and the real difficulty in the submission of

Anglicans to another ceremony of "ordination" lies in the fact already implied by Mr. Fletcher—namely that ceremonies must mean something, and, presumably, something roughly the same for all concerned. Now what, at present could an "ordination" of Anglicans by Romans mean? Anglicans have seen Roman arguments about their orders and remain, before God, unconvinced. In what sense then could they submit to "ordination" by a Roman Bishop, save as an act of charity to their brother's weakness? And what Roman Bishop could possibly accept *that* as a proper "intention" for ordination? Perhaps "conditional ordination" may be the answer—like "conditional baptism": "If thou art not a Bishop, then. . . ." Anglicans might be brought to submit thus far—I see Dr. Fisher already prepared to be "unified" in another direction. Would Rome be prepared to concede a doubt? By all means let us yield to holy doubt! Disputes about Anglican Orders (between 1549 and 196-!) could then be relegated to their proper place—University Common Rooms—and the rest of the Church would be that much freer to get on with its work. But I presume too far—the only point I really want to make is that we must *all* think again.

Nor is this only true of orders. Despite Mr. Fletcher's charming disposal of other difficulties in his first letter, there remains what he would call "a regrettably widespread belief" in Anglican and Protestant Churches that "something is amiss" with Roman theology. We still need to be assured that what Rome understands by Papal Infallibility is compatible with Catholicism; we are still concerned by the fact that Rome's official teaching sets forth certain doctrines (whose antiquity or truth we are not concerned to dispute) about Our Lady as being *necessary parts of the Catholic faith*—contrary to the teaching of the Fathers. Re-thinking needs to be done on these matters—and not all by us.

Yours faithfully,
M. J. C. Bryan.

Reigate.

CLERGY PAY

Dear Sir,

In your November. 1960 issue I did not say, nor infer, that every Incumbent should receive a net income of £1,000 after Income Tax had been paid. We do not "receive" money from the Inland Revenue

but the Church. However, the Association at its Conference, held in Ridley Hall, Cambridge, from 11th-15th September, confirmed this view. Moreover, the Conference were of the opinion that the Church Commissioners has sufficient money to pay every retired clergyman £500 per annum by right and widows of clergymen £400 from all sources.

Yours faithfully,
EDWARD G. COURTMAN
Hon. Secretary Parochial Clergy Association.

CHRISTMAS CARDS

Dear Sir,

George Brand should ask the S.S.M. at Kelham for a sample of their Christmas cards. We have been buying them for years, and are always well served.

Yours in Christ,
JEAN CLARKE.

Norwich.

PURITANS AND MUSIC

Dear Sir,

In the October PRISM there is an article on page 62 by a certain Mr. Ackroyd, As he mentions me by name, perhaps I may be allowed briefly to reply. In effect I have neither leisure nor inclination to answer at length.

However I am glad to have caused a little amusement to the gentleman by my curious ignorance of history. I doubt whether this amusement was shared by music loving Christians in England under the Commonwealth, when, in 1644, the spiritual ancestors of the said Mr. Ackroyd destroyed, by law, nearly all the existing organs in England, so that few pre-Commonwealth organs remain.

I no longer have a copy of my article on the Folk Mass, so I cannot check my writing. Perhaps I should have said "the true Puritan would have no music except metrical psalms". In fact Isaac Watts rescued Nonconformity from dullness and made hymn singing respectable. I doubt whether he would have received the approval of the most likeable of the early Puritan martyrs, "little" Bilney, who "thought that musical services were a mockery of God" (quoted from Maynard Smith).

If I still amuse Mr. Ackroyd, perhaps I may lead him to read some of the works of the sixteenth century Puritans—before the time of the corrupt following of Cromwell's chaplains. Try Becon's once popular book "The Jewel of Joy". There he will read "Music is a mere vain and trifling science, that it becometh no man, born or appointed to matters of gravity, to spend much time about it".

Yours faithfully,
ALFRED GOWER-JONES

Manchester.

P.S. I hope the perturbed spirits of the Roundheads do not interfere with the working of the elevated organ at Pilgrim Church.

P.P.S. I really am grateful for Mr. Ackroyd's gentle rebuke. I have long tried to find a quotation from a sixteenth century or early seventeenth century Puritan writer in praise of music. My search is now over. I am sure that Mr. Ackroyd, with his claimed knowledge of history, can fill the gap.

SCUM OF THE EARTH

Sir,

Roger Tennant is dead right about the necessity to contract out of any "success-system", Catholic or Evangelical. But he writes as if the Liturgical Movement had never happened. There are hundreds, not tens, of parishes, where no one claims to have arrived, but where people (including priests) are seeking to love their neighbours humbly and intelligently. They are characterised, not by a determination to establish a new system, but by an almost neurotic obsession with "not being a movement"; and following up every kind of spiritual and social experiment which expresses service and brokenness.

Yours sincerely,
BASIL HIGGINSON.

Manchester.

SOCIOLOGY

Sir,

I must first apologise to you sir for the illegibility of my signature. Your predecessor had got used to it, and I had been out of contact so long that I neither knew there was a new editor nor that the office

had moved. (Action at Holy Loch against Polaris and before that in prison after Foulness).

I am aware that Maurice Reckitt has done excellent work in the past, indeed I have in my time been an admirer of his; though I confess that I am somewhat astonished that he chooses of all his former comrades to boast of Chesterton—still chacun a son gout. I would sir however suggest that both people and the conditions in which they live are apt to change, and so the fact that someone in the past has done much to heal the ills of society is neither a proof that he still intends to, or that if he does so intend his analysis of the current evils in society is such as to enable him to rectify them or work to that end constructively.

Nor am I unaware of the history of the early Christian Socialists; they too did in their day much that was good; but nevertheless the good that they did is outweighed by the fact that F. D. Maurice is now chiefly remembered as the traditional Christian authority against conscientious objection, for militarism and for the authority of the centralised state. He, in the middle of the "Kingdom of God", wrote as the largest single chapter of that work, in total conflict with the logical methodology of the work and conflicting with the overall philosophy and theology of the rest of the book, a statement of justification for militarism that has been a stumbling block for many Christian radicals subsequently. In it, he argues that since the Caesaro-Papist period gave way to the rise of Nation States; it was therefore God's will that Catholic Universalism should go; and that therefore the belief of the Early Church—though firmly rooted on the Gospels and St. Paul—that it was God's will that all men should be one, was false. Even the Presbyterians whose beliefs Maurice earlier analyses and criticises, never took Predestination to the blasphemous lengths that are implied by this. If Maurice be justified, the Cross was a mockery and Belsen was God's will.

However it was not on this that I based my arguments, I said thinking more of Stuart Headlam and Conrad Noel than of their precursors, that Christian Socialists for the most part tended to talk of Libertarian Guild Socialism, and subsequently proceded to vote for Authoritarian etatist Fabianism, (or Stalinism which is Fabianism without Democracy, having the same elitist concept of introducing Socialism from above in a tightly centralised state). I think it bad to be driven to the slaughter, by someone who in driving me believing he is doing the right thing; but I think it far worse when

the drover has previously agreed with me on the evil involved; but this is precisely the record of Christian Socialism.

Yours faithfully,

W.11. LAURENS OTTER.

CONGREGATION v. PARISH

Dear Sir,

To take a remark—"(I am) the incumbent of a church where there are plenty of other churches around to which people can go if they don't like what he is doing." (Fr. Croft: October PRISM)—out of its context, seems to spotlight one of the vices of Anglo-Catholicism today. In the large towns, the individual, parish churches are losing otherwise faithful parishioners to eclectic congregations. People moreover do not seem to realise the unCatholicity of these congregations.

Priests conniving at this disloyalty by ministering to a regular non-parochial congregation (and especially those priests having only minute parishes of their own), by referring to themselves suavely as "congregational ministers", would seem to be no less than accessories after the fact.

Surely these absentee parishioners are needed in their home parishes for work there. The family worshipping around Christ's Table in these non-parochial churches often appears to have little kinship other than common interest in the now largely out-of-date externals of turn-of-the-century High Churchism. To hive ourselves off within the Church into cliques is a contradiction of Catholicism.

Most of the churches involved have done a fine missionary job in the past. Now, most of the objects for which they fought have been achieved, they are, in their drain on the funds of the faithful, proving a stumbling block to the needs of other churches. It is a terrible thing to have to say but such congregational churches are more concerned with the ninety and nine who are faithful rather than with the one (and ten thousand) outside their walls.

Yours faithfully,

Hove. ANTHONY PARTRIDGE.

ORDINATION OF CHILDREN

Dear Sir,

Like Fr. Cowan we in this parish have long felt that the laity are not sufficiently used—especially the young people who are tomorrow's church. We have therefore revived the ancient custom of dancing before the altar, a ceremony, I believe, still observed in the Coptic Church. On greater festivals—Harvest, Crowning of the May Queen, etc.—our boys' club gives a gymnastic display in the chancel in place of the Introit. This is, of course, a logical extension of the custom of having boy bishops. We have also tried to give women a place in the liturgy. All our servers are women, and they wear robes tastefully designed by the W-rh-m guild in strict accordance with the ornaments rubric of the Book of Common Prayer.

At the moment we are planning to send the entire Mothers Union to Sweden. On their return we feel that they will form an interesting pressure group.

I am yours faithfully,
J. M. MATHER,
"Church of the Three Graces".

London, W.2.

Dear Sir,

Those of your readers who have stood in wonder before the diminutive altar of the Children's Chapel in Guildford Cathedral will be grateful to Fr. Cowan for his timely article. This little altar clearly envisages a child celebrant; and we should be proud of the fact that the design of our newest Cathedral is in line with the findings of contemporary scholarship.

Yours truly,
MICHAEL HICKLEY.

W.12.

LITURGICAL LESSONS

Dear Sir,

Poor old 1662. Two things are wrong says Bernard Croft. (1) The length of the service. (2) The order does not take into account those who are not going to communicate.

His own order does nothing to meet the first objection, he removes four items to replace them with five. The Kyries in Greek must be

very helpful to his Greek speaking congregation. Similarly with the "Last Gospel", I fail to see what liturgical significance this particular piece of difficult writing can have. I presume he means the opening verses of St. John's gospel.

When the service includes preparation and ending I cannot see what possible point there is in extending the service either way with preparations in order to prepare and thankyous in order to thank. What often does waste time in Churchmanship of a spicy flavour is the way many priests insist in going into a coma during and after the prayer of consecration.

It was once related to me with approval of a priest who "omitted" to go on to consecrate the wine because of his meditations. He probably had fallen asleep.

As to the second point. I fail to see how any service which includes a communion of the people can possibly avoid making this fact obvious. Those who try, and have tried, generally produce something dreary, amputated or both.

Why should they avoid "communion"? Either they are not confirmed in which case it is about time they considered this obedience to the Church, or they are communicants who prefer to absent themselves possibly because they are commiting the sin of being over scrupulous.

When I read of a new way of shortening of service by adding to it and altering a "communion" service to facilitate non-communicating persons I reckon we have reached the end of one road and it is time to turn back.

Yours faithfully,
BRIAN HEWITT.

Dukinfield.

Review

COUNSEL AND CONSENT, by *Canon Eric Kemp*, S.P.C.K. 27s. 6d.

The Bampton Lectures for 1960 survey the historical synodical government back through English history to the early Church. It need hardly be said that this is done with great learning and lucidity.

The main interest of most PRISM readers, however, will probably be in the last lecture where Canon Kemp discusses the future of the

Church's government. He makes a number of suggestions about synodical government that will make it easy for Parliament to hand over the government of the Church into the Church's hands by making sure that the interests of the laity are safeguarded. He recommends more and smaller dioceses as did Nick Earle in his Penguin *What's Wrong with the Church?* Among minor but important changes that he suggests is the long felt need for the counsels of the Church to take place in the context of worship. It always seems odd that the Church Assembly doesn't begin its deliberations with a great Sung Eucharist. There is an interesting appendix in the form of the text of part of the Church of Scotland Act 1921 which acknowledges on behalf of the State their belief in the religious independence of the Church.

Canon Kemp has a great deal to say on the debate as to the nature and jurisdiction of an Archbishop of a Metropolitan. (For the practical implications of this, see Valerie Pitt's *Comment*.) In the early counsels of the Church it would seem that the Metropolitan was primus inter pares but as the term Archbishop came into use he came to have a different place in the hierarchy over the Bishops of his province but under the Pope. The disposal of the Pope at the Reformation (as far as the Anglican Church was concerned) doesn't seem to have made any difference and it was certainly as an Archbishop rather than as a Metropolitan that Dr. Fisher regarded himself. This would seem to be a corruption from early Church order and it would be better if Archbishops merely acted as the spokesmen of the Bench of Bishops rather than assuming an authority over them. This point arose recently when Dr. Fisher rebuked the Bishop of Woolwich who was the suffragan of another diocesan Bishop. Canon Kemp, however, puts forward the idea of more provinces to go with more dioceses, the Bishops to be purely pastoral and the Archbishops to be such national figures as the Church may need. This, however, again raises the position of the Metropolitan. If he is a national figure he doesn't really have time for his diocese. Is he to be provided with a suffragan—which is a bastard invention—or with a coadjutor? This latter might be the answer.

Answers must be produced to this question and many others raised by Canon Kemp since it is likely that they will be widely discussed in the near future.

TIMOTHY BEAUMONT.

The Coming Great Church

JOHN WILKINSON

The words of the title can be both misleading and dangerous: misleading because they suggest an inevitable success awaiting the efforts of oecumenists, and dangerous because so simple a propaganda goes far in the direction of a blueprint.

But if we hesitate to use "the coming great Church" too freely as a description of our hopes for unity, reunion, or whatever it is, let us at least weigh some of our reasons. "Of course", we say, "I have no idea how we are going to come to reunion." But too often we keep quiet about the fact that we have our own picture of the form that unity will take. "Of course", we whisper to ourselves, "the Pope will have to be at the top." "Of course we shall keep our own liturgy." "Of course we shall have the Ecclesiastical Commissioners." If we are honest with ourselves, we most of us cling to ideas of "the coming great Church" which are a good deal more precise and narrow than Abbé Couturier's definition of a Church united simply according to Christ's will.

Nor, let us face it, does the fact that quite a lot of Christians think unity is a good thing guarantee that we shall get it, even in terms of reunion. I have lately been reading the work of one of the earliest oecumenists, the writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and I have been somewhat shaken.

Markus Barth, in his highly prismatic study of the Epistle (*The Broken Wall*, London 1960) complains of our tendency to answer questions about the unity of the Church in terms of dualism. Commenting on the readiness of some Christians to compromise, he says (p. 96):

> The dualism . . . may be expressed in terms of time. Then the "two natures" of the Church are said to reflect the tension between what the Church is "already now", and what she is "not yet". Or the tension between appearance and essence, between fact and ideal, or between history and eschatology is put into the foreground.

Each of these compromises is expressed in philosophical terms, for no one can be a philosopher unless he first becomes a dab at explaining why a spade is not a spade.

Ephesians is not concerned with philosophy, nor even, one might

feel, with self-consistency. It might even be objected that it was not concerned with oecumenism either, for it was written before the Reformation. But unity is certainly one of its writer's themes, and of it he says two important things: first that there is "unity inherent in our faith in Christ" (4.13), that already Christ has "broken down the enmity which stood like a dividing wall" (2.14), and that unity is thus already achieved: then again unity appears to be something far in the future, "when the time was ripe . . . that the universe, all in heaven and on earth, might be brought into a unity in Christ" (1.10), "so shall we at last attain to the unity inherent in our faith" (4.13, once more).

This is all very well. If we look back out of our present situation in which there is the Roman chapel up the road and the Baptists round the corner, we can see beyond it the truth that God is One. Unity is part of His being, and His unity gives some basic unity to all the world. Nor is it difficult (so calloused we are when we speculate about these things!) to talk of the unity consummated in a heaven where there is no tear of discord, no sigh of despair. But if this is all we get from Ephesians, better leave it unread.

There is more. "Spare no effort", says the writer, "to make fast with bonds of peace the unity which the Spirit gives" (4.3). Unity, then, is not only something there already in the being of God, and achieved in the work of Christ. Nor is it simply one of the unimaginable perfections of heaven. It is something we must secure for ourselves, and make our own.

Thus we have an oecumenical programme after all. Our task is to make God's unity our own, and to enter into what He already is and has done. Put that way, as it so often and so maddeningly is at the end of sermons, we may still be left in the air. But Ephesians is more practical. "Be humble always and gentle, and patient too. Be forbearing with one another and charitable" (4.2). Not for us to complain about the *New English Bible*, and the difficulty of understanding "bonds of peace". We enter into God's unity when we behave like Christians to one another.

Then where does reunion come into the picture? That is one of the answers that neither Ephesians nor Abbé Couturier attempted to give. Certainly we can say that, child or parent, husband or wife, Greek Orthodox or Seventh-Day Adventist, nothing makes us more deeply one than our knowledge of Christ and life in Him. And if the Church were obviously, visibly one, it would be a sign of that

truth. Also, obviously enough, the divisions among the Churches are at least a signal reminder, perhaps even a sacrament, that the separated Churches are guilty of sin, and are in some measure disunited from God as they are from each other.

What has shaken me in Ephesians is the realisation that "the coming great Church", that supposed triumph of tact, diplomacy, and organisation, is not the objective of oecumenism. It will be very little use having a Church with a united organisation unless it is a sign of a prior union with Christ, a feeling-out towards the consummate unity of heaven. Without Christians in it who love one another, that Church will be as grave a scandal as, God forgive us, we are today.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Martin Jarrett-Kerr is a priest of the Community of the Resurrection. He has worked in S. Africa and is the author of several books on Africa, D. H. Lawrence and other topics.

Peter Coleman, LL.B., worked with the S.C.M. and is Chaplain to King's College, London.

Leslie Harman is Vicar of Shellingford, Berks.

Christopher Wansey is Rector of Woodford, a Proctor in Convocation, and a pain in the neck of the Establishment.

Henry Burgess is a priest in the Diocese of Birmingham and a Proctor in Convocation.

Anthony Hyland works in an architectural firm in Ghana and has contributed poetry to PRISM in the past.

Nicholas Mosley is an ex-editor of PRISM, a novelist and the biographer of Fr. Raynes.

Simon Phipps who was Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge, is Industrial Chaplain to the Diocese of Coventry.

John Wilkinson is on the staff of the newly-formed theological college in Jerusalem.